Light through a Prism: New Avenues of Inquiry for the Pauline Υἱοθεσία Metaphors

Erin Heim

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
at the University of Otago, Dunedin,
New Zealand

January 2014

Copyright © 2014
Erin M. Heim

For my parents.

August 9, 1983

ABSTRACT

This thesis utilizes a methodology developed from contemporary philosophical[1] and cognitive approaches to metaphor theory to present a reading of the four υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans and Galatians which attends to both their textual and extra-textual features. Earlier studies on the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors have tended to focus heavily on their background or have tended to synthesize the metaphors into a univocal "meaning." However, contemporary theories of metaphor in a variety of fields, such as philosophy of language, cognitive and sociolinguistics, and communication and rhetoric, have shown metaphors to be creative, dynamic, and multivalent in meaning, and have also cast doubt on whether metaphorical meaning can be transferred from one context to another. Moreover, insights from cognitive approaches to metaphor have shown metaphors to be capable of influencing the perceptions, emotions, and identity of their readers or hearers. I argue that the combination of these diverse perspectives on metaphor complement each other to create a robust methodology for treating metaphors within the biblical text, which I have applied to the exegesis of the four υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans and Galatians.

This thesis has two foci: (1) to establish a methodology for reading biblical metaphors that appreciates both their textual and extra-textual elements, and (2) to utilize this methodology to read the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors in order to appreciate components of these metaphors that have not been previously identified, or have hitherto been neglected or ignored. After establishing the need for such an inquiry by reviewing recent studies on the υἱοθεσία metaphor in chapter one, the remaining chapters of the first half of the thesis (chapters 2-4) elucidate and defend the methodology I have developed by combining contemporary theories of metaphor from several other disciplines. The second half of the thesis is composed of three chapters, one devoted to each passage where υἱοθεσία metaphors occur (Galatians 4:1-7; Romans 8:12-25; Romans 9:1-5).

[1] Throughout the thesis I will use the designation "philosophical" to denote theories developed primarily by philosophers of language, and occasionally to denote contributions from literary theorists which share much in common with theories drawn from philosophy of language.

Although interpreters have tended to collapse the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans and Galatians into a single emphasis, or have tended to use one metaphor as the interpretive starting point to read the others, in light of the methodological considerations raised in part one, this thesis attempts to appreciate the different emphases of each passage and hold their meanings in tension.

Utilizing the methodology developed in part one of the thesis, I show that the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:1-7 is primarily concerned with highlighting the gentile audience's lineage through Christ and faith rather than through Abraham and law observance, focusing attention heavily on the vertical relationship between the believers and the Father. In contrast, the two υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 serve to highlight the eschatological and existential tension the believers experience, which is grounded in their reception of the Spirit. The final exegetical chapter argues that the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4 serves as Paul's unique "reflection" of the Israelite sonship tradition seen in Old Testament and intertestamental texts. This "reflection" serves to highlight the intertwined relationship between the Israelites and the gentile believers, and draws attention to the consistent nature and character of God's actions toward them both.

The conclusion highlights the key contributions the methodology makes to the exegesis of the υἱοθεσία metaphors. In reviewing the ground covered in the first seven chapters of the thesis, I underscore the distinctive emphasis of each υἱοθεσία metaphor, showing that each metaphor possesses a nuanced implicative complex, which makes it much more appropriate to speak of a spectrum of meaning created by the υἱοθεσία metaphors rather than a univocal metaphorical "meaning" for the Pauline concept of υἱοθεσία. Within this spectrum of meaning, I also point out several key areas of commonality between the implicative complexes of the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans and Galatians, which shows that Paul's uses of the metaphor are complementary, rather than contradictory, to one another. I also explore briefly how the υἱοθεσία metaphors are currently being used in contemporary contexts to support current practices of adoption, and the potential impact the transposition of the narratives of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors have on how present-day Christians, especially in Western contexts, view the adoption of children.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The impetus to research and write a thesis on the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors came from a deeply personal, and joyful, yet sometimes difficult, part of my life experience as an adopted child. There are numerous people who have been sources of encouragement throughout this process in the truest sense of the word—those whose support has given me the courage to delve not only into intensive research, but also within myself, to complete this thesis.

My supervisors, Paul Trebilco and Lynne Baab, who never spared me the difficult questions. You two are outstanding.

My fellow students, whose insights often illuminated possibilities I would have never considered on my own. More than that, whose friendship and camaraderie, morning teas, impromptu lunches, and discussions have made this journey richer.

My friends, both in Dunedin and abroad, whose timely words of encouragement spurred me on at several critical moments during the research process. I especially want to mention the women in my bible study, who showed me each week the intersection between faith and academics. I also mention specifically Stephanie Hoselton, who read my final manuscript out of the kindness of her heart. Thank you, and I hope it blessed you in some small measure.

Lastly, words cannot express my gratitude for my family's support during the last three years. To my husband, Peter, who was my faithful companion during many long walks where together we mulled over my research. I truly could not have done this without you. To my two children, Elise and Finn, who were both born during the course of writing this thesis. You have taught me the depth of the riches of the Father's love for us; I am privileged to be your mother. Lastly, to my parents, Paul and Marcia, who adopted me and took me as their own. We are all the lucky ones.

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1
1. Previous Research: A Critical Overview 2
2. The Scope of This Project 15
3. Overview of Chapters 19

II. A WORKING THEORY OF METAPHOR 22
1. INTRODUCTION 22
2. METAPHOR: A WORKING DEFINITION 23
2.1 Substitution or Comparison Theories 24
2.2. Contemporary Theories of Metaphor 27
2.3 Janet Martin Soskice: An Interanimation Theory of Metaphor 32
3. METAPHOR AND EXEGESIS 48
3.1 Text, Context, Intertextuality, and Metaphorical Meaning 49
3.2 Meaning is Indeterminate 59
3.3 Metaphor and Epistemology 61
4. CONCLUSION 65

III. METAPHOR: PERCEPTION, EMOTION, INTIMACY, AND IDENTITY FORMATION 68
1. INTRODUCTION 68
2. METAPHOR AND THE INDIVIDUAL 71
2.1 Metaphor and Perception 72
2.2 Metaphor and Emotion 80
3. METAPHOR AND COMMUNITY 88
3.1 Metaphor and the Creation of Intimacy 88
3.2 Metaphor and Group Identity 95
4. CONCLUSION 101

IV. SKETCHING THE MODEL: THE BACKGROUND AND CONVENTIONAL USE OF ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ 103
1. INTRODUCTION 103
2. CONVENTIONAL MEANING, BACKGROUND, AND TRANSLATION: SOME METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS 107
2.1. The Conventional Meaning of Υἱοθεσία 108
2.2 Other Proposed Translations, Backgrounds, and Models 113
3. POSSIBLE MODELS FOR ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ 121
3.1 A Model from the Jewish Background 121
3.2. Greek Background 126
3.3 Roman Background 130
4. CONCLUSION 135

V. WE HAVE RECEIVED THE ADOPTION TO SONSHIP: THE ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ METAPHOR IN GALATIANS 4:5 138
1. INTRODUCTION 138
1.1 Introduction to the Exegetical Chapters 138
1.2 Introduction to Galatians 139
1.3 Galatians 4:5 in the Context of Galatians 144
2. METAPHOR AND TEXT 152

2.1 The Metaphorical Utterance ... *152*
2.2 The Frame: 4:1-7 ... *155*
2.3 Model, Tenor, and Vehicle ... *160*
2.4 Emphasis and Resonance ... *164*
2. METAPHOR AND AUDIENCE ... 166
3.1 Metaphor and Perception ... *166*
3.2 Highlighting and Hiding ... *171*
3.3 Metaphor and Emotion ... *176*
3.4 Metaphor and Community ... *182*
4. CONCLUSION ... 187

VI. WE OURSELVES GROAN INWARDLY: THE ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ METAPHORS IN ROMANS 8:15 AND 23 ... 189
1. INTRODUCTION ... 189
1.1. Paul's Audience in Rome ... *190*
1.2 Romans 8:15-23: Preliminary Exegetical Issues ... *193*
2. METAPHOR AND TEXT ... 198
2.1 The Metaphorical Utterance in Romans 8:15 and 8:23 ... *198*
2.2. Models, Tenors, and Vehicles in Romans 8:15 and 8:23 ... *201*
2.3 The Frame: Romans 8:12-25 ... *211*
2.4 Emphasis and Resonance in Romans 8:15 and 23 ... *213*
3. METAPHOR AND AUDIENCE ... 215
3.1 Metaphor and Perception ... *216*
3.2 Metaphor and Emotion in Romans 8 ... *226*
3.3 Metaphor and Community in Romans 8 ... *233*
4. CONCLUSION ... 238

VII. TO WHOM BELONGS THE ADOPTION: THE ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ METAPHOR IN ROMANS 9:4 ... 241
1. INTRODUCTION ... 241
2. METAPHOR AND TEXT ... 242
2.1 The Metaphorical Utterance ... *242*
2.2 Tenor and Vehicle ... *247*
2.3 The Frame of Romans 9:4 ... *253*
2.4 The Emphasis and Resonance of Υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4 ... *254*
3. METAPHOR AND INTERTEXTUALITY IN ROMANS 9:4 ... 257
3.1 The Old Testament Literature ... *263*
3.2 The Intertestamental Literature ... *270*
3.3 Paul's "Reflection" of the Sonship Tradition ... *283*
4. METAPHOR AND AUDIENCE ... 293
4.1. Metaphor and Perception ... *294*
4.2 Metaphor and Emotion in Romans 9:4 ... *300*
4.3 Metaphor and Community ... *304*
5. CONCLUSION ... 311

VIII. CONCLUSION ... 313
1. CONCLUDING SUMMARY AND SYNTHESIS ... 313
1.1 The Contribution of Each Chapter ... *313*
1.2 Toward a Synthesis ... *318*
2. MOVING FORWARD ... 322
2.1 Ephesians 1:5 ... *322*

2.2 The Υἱοθεσία Metaphors in 21st-Century Contexts 323

IX. BIBLIOGRAPHY 326

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ABR	*Australian Biblical Review*
AER	*American Ecclesiastical Review*
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
ALGHJ	Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
AOTC	Abingdon Old Testament Commentary
AsTJ	*Asbury Theological Journal*
BBR	*Bulletin for Biblical Research*
BEvT	Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie
BFCT	Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
Bib	*Biblica*
BibInt	Biblical Interpretation
BSac	*Bibliotheca Sacra*
BT	*The Bible Translator*
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin*
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
ConBNT	Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series
ConBOT	Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series
DBAT	Dielheimer Blätter zum Alten Testament und seiner Rezeption in der Alten Kirche
EA	*Epigraphica Anatolica*
EvQ	*Evangelical Quarterly*
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FAT II	Forschungen zum Alten Testament Series II
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum neuen Testament
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
HvTSt	*Hervormde teologise studies*
IG II^2	*Inscriptiones atticae Euclidis anno anteriores*
ITQ	*Irish Theological Quarterly*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JBMW	*Journal of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JRS	*Journal of Roman Studies*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of Old Testament*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series

JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
LA	*Liber Annuus*
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
MScRel	*Mélanges de science religieuse*
NDT	Das Neue Testament Deutsch
NEchtB	Neue Echter Bibel
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
NTL	New Testament Library
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTP	*Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*
RelSRev	*Religious Studies Review*
ResQ	*Restoration Quarterly*
RevExp	*Review and Expositor*
RevQ	*Revue de Qumran*
SBET	*Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology*
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBT II	Studies in Biblical Theology: Series II
SJT	*Scottish Journal of Theology*
SP	Sacra Pagina
SPAW	*Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*
SR	*Studies in Religion*
THKNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
TynBul	*Tyndale Bulletin*
USQR	*Union Seminary Quarterly Review*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT II	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament: Series II
WW	*Word and World*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*
ZPE	*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*

I. INTRODUCTION

Author Bernard Malamud quipped, "I love metaphor. It provides two loaves where there seems to be one. Sometimes it throws in a load of fish."[1] Metaphor is a powerful and mysterious tool of communication, one which permeates everyday language and pervades great literature, both sacred and profane. Research in areas such as philosophy of language, cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics, communication and rhetoric, and anthropology has shown metaphor to be an integral and influential component of the conceptual framework created by language, and both writers and appreciators of metaphor attribute the potency of metaphor to its enigmatic ability to "provide two loaves where there seems to be one." Malamud's enthusiasm, which is echoed by so many other writers and theorists, should motivate Pauline scholars to be enamored with metaphor and its ability to miraculously transform and multiply images and meanings. However, given the analytical framework of much of biblical exegesis, interpreters of the Pauline text perhaps too often meet metaphor with a sort of suspicious "anti-supernaturalism" and tend to strip a metaphor of its mysterious qualities in an attempt to map out its precise or "literal" meaning.

One of the chief aims of this study is to examine four occurrences of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in the Pauline corpus (Gal 4:5, Rom 8:15; Rom 8:23; Rom 9:4) with the expressed intention of uncovering and appreciating elements of biblical metaphors that are often treated as superfluous to its "meaning."[2] Previous studies on the υἱοθεσία metaphor have tended to focus tightly on the question of background and occasionally on its theological significance in the Pauline corpus. However, little consideration has been given to how precisely the various proposals for the background of the υἱοθεσία metaphor relate to the question of the metaphor's meaning, or meanings, within the Pauline letters. Although this question may seem self-evident, research from other disciplines suggests that reading metaphors is not

---

[1] Daniel Stern, "The Art of Fiction LII: Bernard Malamud," *The Paris Review* 61 (1975): 52.

[2] The υἱοθεσία metaphor in Ephesians 1:5 will not be treated for three reasons: (1) the metaphor occurs in the context of a prayer rather than within the main argument of the letter, (2) concerns over authorship and audience make situating the text within a historical context more difficult, and (3) the combination of the first two factors would require more time and attention than I am able to undertake in this study. However, this is certainly a most viable avenue for further research.

necessarily a straightforward process. Rather, metaphorical meaning is produced through an intricate dance between background and context, between metaphor and model. Moreover, insights from other disciplines have shown that metaphors communicate much more than mere cognitive content, and often serve a psychosocial function as well. In light of the advances in contemporary metaphor theory, the goal of this thesis is to wrestle with the question of how the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors[3] work to create meaning, perception, emotion, and a sense of group identity for their original audiences.

1. Previous Research: A Critical Overview

Relevant previous research for this study falls under two main subcategories: research in Pauline studies which utilizes contemporary metaphor theory, and specific and targeted research on the Pauline occurrences of υἱοθεσία. However, to date no study has utilized a methodology drawn from current theories of metaphor in order to exegete the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans and Galatians. Moreover, there is room for refinement and expansion of the method for treating Pauline metaphors in light of several neglected areas of research in metaphor theory. This thesis seeks to fill both of these gaps by providing a robust methodology for reading the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors.

1.1 Studies on Other Pauline Metaphors which Utilize Contemporary Metaphor Theory

In recent years, in addition to the growing number of publications that utilize metaphor theory for the exegesis of biblical texts,[4] several studies on specific Pauline metaphors have emerged containing varying levels of engagement with current theories of metaphor. Four of the most notable studies include Nijay Gupta's,

---

[3] In this thesis I will refer to the "υἱοθεσία metaphors" rather than the "υἱοθεσία metaphor" in order to emphasize that these metaphors are not easily synthesized into a univocal meaning. A detailed explanation will be given in section 2 of this chapter.

[4] Several examples of studies with thorough and meticulous approaches to metaphor include Allison Gray, *Psalm 118 in Words and Pictures* (BibInt 127, Leiden: Brill, 2013); Hanne Løland, *Silent or Salient Gender?: The Interpretation of Gendered God-Language in the Hebrew Bible Exemplified in Isaiah 42, 46, and 49* (FAT II 32, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008); Bonnie Howe, *Because You Bear This Name: Conceptual Metaphor and the Moral Meaning of 1 Peter* (BibInt 81, Leiden: Brill, 2006); Alec Basson, *Divine Metaphors in Selected Hebrew Psalms of Lamentation* (FAT II 32, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2006); Nelly Stienstra, *YHWH Is the Husband of His People: Analysis of a Biblical Metaphor with Special Reference to Translation* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993); Marc Zvi Brettler, *God Is King: Understanding an Israelite Metaphor* (JSOTSup 76, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989).

Worship that Makes Sense to Paul,[5] Gregory Dawes's, *The Body in Question*,[6] Reidar Aasgaard's, *"My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!,"*[7] and Beverly Roberts Gaventa's, *Our Mother Saint Paul*.[8] Of the four studies, Gupta's recent monograph, at its surface, seems to offer the most integrated approach to the Pauline metaphors. Gupta's methodology utilizes the theories of Janet Martin Soskice,[9] and George Lakoff and Mark Johnson,[10] drawing both from philosophical approaches and cognitive approaches to metaphor in order to analyze and map Paul's "non-atonement cultic metaphors."[11] However, although Gupta's approach utilizes key theorists from varying approaches to metaphor, his engagement with them in the exegetical portion of his monograph is limited. Moreover, his characterization of "metaphorizing" as "the comparison of something (like the people of God) to something else (like the temple),"[12] which is foundational to his study, is in direct conflict with Soskice's own views on metaphor and thus raises serious questions about his level of engagement with her material.[13] Although Gupta's study does begin to utilize cross-disciplinary metaphor theories for the exegesis and interpretation of Pauline texts, his methodology leaves room for expansion and improvement.

Among current studies of metaphors in the Pauline corpus, Dawes's study stands out for its methodological rigor. Using a philosophical approach to language and metaphor, Dawes evaluates the theories of I. A. Richards,[14] Max Black,[15] and Monroe Beardsley,[16] also drawing heavily on the work of Soskice. In his introduction, Dawes identifies a primary weakness among most exegetical investigations of biblical metaphors: the lack of "sensitivity to the nature and functioning of metaphorical

---

[5] Nijay Gupta, *Worship that Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul's Cultic Metaphors* (BZNW 175, Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010).
[6] Gregory W. Dawes, *The Body in Question: Metaphor and Meaning in the Interpretation of Ephesians 5:21-33* (BibInt 30, Leiden: Brill, 1998).
[7] Reidar Aasgaard, *"My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!": Christian Siblingship in Paul* (JSNTSup 265, London: T & T Clark, 2004).
[8] Beverly Roberts Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul* (Louisville: WJK, 2007).
[9] Janet Martin Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985).
[10] George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).
[11] Gupta, *Worship that Makes Sense to Paul*, 4.
[12] Ibid., 2.
[13] Soskice's definition will be discussed at length in section 2.3 of chapter 2.
[14] I. A. Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (London: Oxford University Press, 1965).
[15] Max Black, "More About Metaphor" in *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed., ed. Andrew Ortony (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 19-41; idem, *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy* (Ithaca: Cornell, 1962).
[16] Monroe Beardsley, "The Metaphorical Twist," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 22 (1962): 293-307.

language."[17] Dawes's study seeks to rectify this lack of sensitivity by thoughtfully employing a contemporary philosophical theory of metaphor in a close reading of the body metaphor in Ephesians, and his exegesis reflects a deep understanding of the philosophical and literary complexities of the theories with which he engages. However, Dawes's methodology does not seek to address a metaphor's impact on extra-linguistic features, such as cognition, perception, emotion, and identity. These elements, which would undoubtedly complement Dawes's excellent literary and philosophical analysis, are incorporated into the methodological approach of this thesis alongside insights from philosophical and literary theories.

Drawing from contemporary cognitive theories on metaphor, Aasgaard's methodology represents a needed complement to Dawes's work. Aasgaard relies heavily on well-known cognitive theorists such as Lakoff and Johnson, Mark Turner,[18] and Black. Aasgaard views metaphor as "an understanding/experience, which has been transferred from one area to another," and utilizes Lakoff and Johnson's terminology of "source" and "target" to map insights from the source domain, "siblingship in antiquity," onto the target, "Christian relations."[19] Aasgaard's methodology and exegesis underscore key features of metaphor, such as their ability to shape perception and to highlight and hide elements of their subjects, but his engagement with metaphor as a literary device is less rigorous.[20] A truly robust approach to metaphor in the biblical text must seek to treat both its linguistic and extra-linguistic elements.

Gaventa's study on the maternal metaphors in the Pauline letters includes insights from several other important contributors to contemporary metaphor theory, most notably Ted Cohen and Wayne Booth.[21] Gaventa argues that Cohen's work,

---

[17] Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 16.
[18] George Lakoff, and Mark Turner, *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989); see also Mark Turner, *Death is the Mother of Beauty: Mind, Metaphor, Criticism* (Christchurch, NZ: Cybereditions, 2000).
[19] Aasgaard, *"My Beloved Brothers and Sisters*,*"* 26.
[20] E.g. Aasgaard states, "The presence of a metaphor can be indicated syntactically, by 'as', 'like', and so on.…But it may just as well be recognizable only semantically" (Ibid., 26). Aasgaard's statement betrays a common misconception that adding a comparative term does not change the meaning of a metaphor; this will be discussed in more detail in section 2 of chapter 2.
[21] Ted Cohen, "Metaphor and the Cultivation of Intimacy," in *On Metaphor*, ed. Sheldon Sacks (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), 1-10; see also idem, *Thinking of Others: On the Talent for Metaphor* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008); Wayne Booth, "Metaphor as Rhetoric: The Problem of Evaluation," in *On Metaphor*, ed. Sheldon Sacks (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), 47-70; see also idem, *The Company We Keep: An Ethics of Fiction* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).

which focuses on how metaphors cultivate intimacy, elucidates how biblical authors can employ metaphors in order to achieve non-cognitive objectives, such as reestablishing relationships or creating connections between author and audience.[22] Similarly, Gaventa draws upon Booth's insights regarding a metaphor's persuasive capabilities which require "a decision on the part of the hearer or reader."[23] Thus the audience must decide to either join in understanding the metaphor or resist the author's invitation. In her exegesis of the Pauline maternal metaphors, Gaventa uses Booth's work to highlight the social and paraenetic functions of the Pauline maternal metaphors alongside their theological content. Gaventa's identification of the capacity of biblical metaphor to cultivate intimacy between author and audience represents a most interesting augmentation to other methodologies where the metaphor's cognitive content is of prime concern. However, the work of Cohen and Booth is largely theoretical, and Gaventa's methodology can now be supplemented by several quantitative studies that demonstrate the kinds of bonds between speakers that result from the use of metaphor.[24] Moreover, Gaventa's methodology would also be enriched by an examination of the effect of metaphor on the emotions of the hearer or reader, which is integrated alongside the insights from Cohen and Booth in the methodological portion of this thesis.

1.2 Studies on the Pauline Υἱοθεσία Metaphors

In addition to a number of articles and short studies on the Pauline υἱοθεσία passages and their background,[25] five key monographs have been written in the field

---

[22] Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 11-12.
[23] Ibid., 11.
[24] This will be discussed in more detail in section 3 of chapter 3.
[25] Shorter background studies focusing on the Jewish background of the term include: William H. Rossell, "New Testament Adoption—Graeco-Roman or Semitic," *JBL* 50 (1931): 186-200; James I. Cook, "The Concept of Adoption in the Theology of Paul," in *Saved by Hope: Essays in Honor of Richard C. Oudersluys*, ed. Brendan Byrne (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 133-44; Martin Schoenberg, "*Huiothesia:* The Adoptive Sonship of the Israelites," *AER* 143 (1960): 261-73. Shorter background studies focusing on Greco-Roman law and practice include: James C. Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, ed. J. Paul Sampley (Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 2003), 42-76; Francis Lyall, "Roman Law in the Writings of Paul: Adoption," *JBL* 88 (1969): 458-66; idem, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons: Legal Metaphors in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Academie Books, 1984), 67-99; Kathleen Corley, "Women's Inheritance Rights in Antiquity and Paul's Metaphor of Adoption," in *A Feminist Companion to Paul*, ed. Amy-Jill Levine (Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 2004), 98-121. Shorter studies focused on theological interpretation or hermeneutical concerns include: Michael Peppard, "Adopted and Begotten Sons of God: Paul and John on Divine Sonship," *CBQ* 73 (2011): 92-110; Trevor Burke, "Adopted as Sons (ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ): The Missing Piece in Pauline Soteriology," in *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman*, ed. Stanley Porter (Leiden:

of biblical studies since 1979 that have critically examined the background and exegetical significance of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in the Pauline corpus: Brendan Byrne's *"Sons of God—Seed of Abraham,"*[26] James M. Scott's *Adoption as Sons of God*,[27] Michael Peppard's *The Son of God in the Roman World*,[28] Caroline Johnson Hodge's *If Sons, Then Heirs*,[29] and Trevor Burke's *Adopted into God's Family*.[30] These studies can be roughly divided into two broad categories: investigations into the background of υἱοθεσία, and hermeneutical approaches to the υἱοθεσία metaphor in the Pauline context.

1.2.1 Background Approaches

Prior to Byrne's seminal study in 1979, most Pauline scholars took for granted that the appropriate background for the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors was the Roman practice of adoption. The aim of Byrne's study was to demonstrate that the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans and Galatians are laden with the imagery of Jewish sonship, which Byrne argues is most appropriately read in light of background texts from the Old Testament and intertestamental literature.[31] Byrne asserts, "Paul works within the Jewish categories, employs Jewish terminology, has recourse to the Jewish basis of proof—Scripture. He may ask his Jewish and judaistic Christian correspondents to turn their theology inside out; he does not require them to embrace

---

Brill, 2008), 259-87; idem, "Pauline Adoption: A Sociological Approach," *EvQ* 73 (2001): 119-34; idem, "Adoption and the Spirit in Romans 8," *EvQ* 70 (1998): 311-24; George C. Gianoulis, "Is Sonship in Romans 8:14-17 a Link with Romans 9?," *BSac* 166 (2009): 70-83; Antonio Aranda, "Imagen de Dios en Christo – Hijos de Dios en Christo: Una Relectura de la Doctrina Anthropológica Paulina," *Scripta Theologica* 39.1 (2007): 37-72; Tim Trumper, "A Fresh Exposition of Adoption: An Outline," *SBET* 23.1 (2005): 60-80; idem, "The Metaphorical Import of Adoption: A Plea for Realisation I: The Adoption Metaphor in Biblical Usage," *SBET* 14 (1996): 129-45; Bernard Rey, "Vie de foi et vie filiale selon Saint Paul," *MScRel* 39.1 (1982): 3-18; Alfio Marcello Buscemi, "Libertà e Huiothesia: Studio Esegetico di Gal 4,1-7," *LA* 30 (1980): 93-136; Daniel J. Theron, "'Adoption' in the Pauline Corpus," *EvQ* 28.1 (1956): 6-14; Norman Mundhenk, "Adoption: Being Recognized as Son," *BT* 59.4 (2008): 169-78; Nigel Watson, "And if Children, Then Heirs – Why Not Sons?," *ABR* 49 (2001): 53-56.

[26] Brendan Byrne, *"Sons of God – Seed of Abraham": A Study of the Idea of the Sonship of God of All Christians in Paul against the Jewish Background* (AnBib 83, Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1979).

[27] James M. Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God: An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ in the Pauline Corpus* (WUNT II 48, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992).

[28] Michael Peppard, *The Son of God in the Roman World: Divine Sonship in Its Social and Political Context* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

[29] Caroline Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).

[30] Trevor Burke, *Adopted into God's Family: Exploring a Pauline Metaphor* (NSBT 22, Downers Grove: IVP, 2006).

[31] Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 1-8.

a totally new conceptuality or learn a new language."[32] Byrne sets out to demonstrate his thesis by appealing to a wide and eclectic array of texts that he analyzes according to the categories: heavenly being (angelic) sonship, Israelite sonship, and royal sonship,[33] and central to his thesis is that the Pauline occurrences of υἱοθεσία should be translated "sonship" rather than "adoption as son."[34] Thus central to Byrne's study is his methodological assumption that the Pauline metaphor is influenced by a particular religious background (Jewish sonship of God) rather than by its social context (Roman adoption).

In light of this survey of Jewish texts which, in his view, demonstrate Paul's continuity with the Jewish notion of "sonship of God," Byrne sees Romans 9:4 as the key to interpreting all of the Pauline occurrences. He argues, "Paul's reference to υἱοθεσία in a formal list of the privileges of Israel in Rom 9:4f would seem to align him very closely to the 'sonship of God' tradition of the Jewish background."[35] However, Byrne recognizes that while Paul is using a traditional category, he has a distinctly christological and eschatological interpretation of sonship that includes gentiles in the purview of the people of God.[36] Byrne concludes, "On every page of Galatians and Romans – not just in Rom 9-11 – one senses the supreme anxiety to show that the unity of Jew and gentile in Christ and the common sharing in the eschatological blessings was what was meant by God all along."[37] This statement is indicative of Byrne's proleptic reading of the Jewish sonship tradition in the Old Testament and intertestamental texts, and although his survey of the texts is thorough, Byrne's approach to the Pauline texts does not address important methodological questions regarding how the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans and Galatians interacts with this background material. Also typical of studies written before the advent of intertextuality in biblical studies, Byrne's methodology gives no consideration to the nature of intertextual relationships based on the texts which he views as forming the background of the Pauline metaphor.[38]

---

[32] Ibid., 220.
[33] Ibid., 9-69.
[34] Ibid., 79-81.
[35] Ibid., 84.
[36] Ibid.
[37] Ibid., 226.
[38] Byrne's methodological assumptions will be treated more extensively in section 3.1 of chapter 2.

Written largely in response to Byrne's monograph, Scott's book *Adoption as Sons of God* is an attempt to locate the meaning of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors in a specific "Jewish adoption" text: 2 Samuel 7:14. Scott devotes considerable space in his erudite study to examining the lexical evidence for not only υἱοθεσία, but all of the members of the adoption word group (εἰσποιεῖν, ἐκποιεῖν, τίθεσθαι, ποιεῖσθαι, υἱοποιεῖσθαι, and υἱοθετεῖν),[39] in order to challenge Byrne's claim that υἱοθεσία in the Pauline corpus should be translated "sonship" and understood against the broader background of the Jewish sonship tradition.[40] However, although Scott challenges the breadth of Byrne's notion of Jewish sonship, Scott argues that the Pauline occurrences of υἱοθεσία are based on a specific Old Testament "Jewish adoption formula" which he sees in Jewish examples of both profane adoption (Gen 48:5-6; Exod 2:10; Esth 2:7, 15),[41] and divine adoption (2 Sam 7:14).[42] Scott then traces the reception of the 2 Samuel 7:14 tradition through pre- and post-exilic Israel and concludes,

> [T]he subsequent Jewish tradition based on 2 Sam. 7:14 oriented the renewal of the covenant relationship, including Israel's divine sonship (cf. Hos. 2:1), to the messianically-interpreted Davidic promise.…Hence the national expectation of divine adoption, converging as it does with the messianic expectation, leads to an appropriation of 2 Sam. 7:14a to the eschatological people of God as a whole.[43]

According to Scott, this national and messianic expectation of eschatological adoption, and the 2 Samuel 7:14 tradition, is the only acceptable background and starting point for the Pauline occurrences of υἱοθεσία.[44] Perhaps the most influential contribution of Scott's thesis is his proposal of a new interpretive framework for Galatians 4:1-7 which he reads not as an example from a Greco-Roman household, but as an allusion to an exodus typology where verses 1-2 refer to Israel's enslavement in Egypt, and verses 3-7 refer to the "Second Exodus" where both Jews and gentiles are adopted as sons and brought "into relation with the messianic Son of

[39] Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 13.
[40] Ibid., 55-57.
[41] Ibid., 74.
[42] Ibid., 100.
[43] Ibid., 117.
[44] Ibid., 269.

God, just as in the 2 Sam. 7:14 tradition."[45] Also in keeping with his emphasis on the importance of the adoption of the Davidide in 2 Samuel 7:14, Scott argues that Romans 1:3-4 indicates the adoption of Christ as the Davidide at the time of his resurrection.[46] According to Scott, Romans 8 indicates that "the sons who share in the messianic inheritance and reign with the Son (vv. 17b, 32b) are adopted on the basis of the same Davidic promise as the Son, because they participate in the sonship of the Son."[47] Scott further concludes that Romans 8 "contains both present and future aspects of υἱοθεσία which are related as successive modes of participating in the sonship of the messianic Son of God by means of the Spirit."[48]

One significant oversight in Scott's treatment of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors is his brief and cursory treatment of Romans 9:4.[49] Apparently Scott assumes its relationship to his thesis regarding the 2 Samuel 7:14 tradition to be self-evident, so in his brief treatment of Romans 9:4 Scott concludes, "ἡ υἱοθεσία refers here [Rom 9:4] to the adoption as sons of God which, according to Hos. 11:1 and Ex. 4:22, Israel received at the Exodus."[50] Interestingly, although Scott criticizes Byrne for his translation "sonship," Byrne's translation in the Pauline corpus is largely influenced by texts such as Exodus 4:22 and Hosea 11:1 which he sees as the primary background for Romans 9:4. Scott indicates that he also sees these texts as the appropriate background for Romans 9:4, even though they lack the specific "Jewish adoption formula" that forms the crux of Scott's argument.[51] It is difficult to ascertain precisely how Scott understands the place of Romans 9:4 within the overall schema of national and messianic adoption based on the 2 Samuel 7:14 tradition, and his explanation of the role and function of Romans 9:4 in the Pauline understanding of υἱοθεσία is sorely lacking. Moreover, Scott's thesis suffers from several fundamental methodological difficulties regarding the relationship between metaphor, background, and audience, as evidenced by his failure to consider the social context of Paul's letters and their likely reception by his audiences in Rome and Galatia. Furthermore, Scott's argument rests on a complicated and torturous intertextual relationship

[45] Ibid., 145-86. Scott's proposed background of Galatians 4:1-7 will be treated extensively in section 1.3 of chapter five.
[46] Ibid., 242-44.
[47] Ibid., 255.
[48] Ibid., 265.
[49] Scott only devotes an excursus of a short paragraph to Romans 9:4 (ibid., 148-49).
[50] Ibid., 149.
[51] Ibid.

between the Pauline texts and the 2 Samuel 7:14 tradition, but his monograph devotes no space to developing a sound methodology of intertextual inquiry and thus many of his conclusions are open to question on methodological grounds.[52]

In his monograph, *The Son of God in the Roman World*, Michael Peppard devotes considerable attention to examining the practice and ideology of Roman adoption in its first-century context. The central premise of his book is that the metaphor of divine sonship has not been adequately considered in light of the Roman sociopolitical environment, and instead the exegesis of divine sonship texts has been unduly influenced by "elite theological debates of later centuries."[53] In order to root the biblical divine sonship metaphor in what Peppard deems to be its appropriate sociopolitical context, Peppard conducts a thorough investigation of the laws and practices of Roman adoption, with the aim of uncovering the imperial ideology that lay behind these practices.[54] From his analysis Peppard concludes, "The imagery of the Roman household, and especially the ruling imperial household, comprised a pervasive cultural ideology within which early Christian authors lived, thought and wrote. A key aspect of this family ideology was the upward mobility of adoption."[55] Peppard continues, "[T]he more powerful a father is—even all-powerful, as a god—the more relevant adoption becomes to understand that father's relationship to his son."[56] Undoubtedly Peppard's analysis of the sociopolitical context and ideology of Roman adoption is the most thorough and incisive discussion of this background material to date, and any further study of the υἱοθεσία metaphors in the New Testament must engage with his discussion of these sources.

However, Peppard's treatment of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors is quite brief and of secondary importance in the scope of his project, which is far more concerned with the reception of divine sonship in pre- and post-Nicene Christianity.[57] Approaching the background of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors from the perspective of Roman adoption, Peppard argues "the imagery is perfectly in line with our

[52] Scott's methodological assumptions regarding intertextuality will be treated in more detail in section 3.1 of chapter 2.
[53] Peppard, *The Son of God*, 3.
[54] Ibid., 50-85.
[55] Ibid., 175.
[56] Ibid., 85.
[57] Ibid., 135-40.

knowledge about adoption in Roman society,"[58] and Paul's use of the metaphor "relies on a crucial feature of the social context – the *certainty* of an adopted son's right to inherit from his adoptive father."[59] Peppard also asserts, "[T]the adoptive metaphor of Christian divine sonship is relatively easy to parse, especially using details of the Greco-Roman social context."[60] Peppard's assessment of the prevalence and permeation of the imperial household ideology in the first century context of the New Testament make the Roman sociopolitical background an essential component to the exegesis of texts where divine sonship is in view, although more work is surely needed to apply Peppard's insights to the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors. However, Peppard's account of divine sonship must also be tempered with notions of divine sonship from the Jewish texts, which were arguably equally influential in Paul's writing and for early Christian communities.[61] Moreover, although Peppard touches on the need to situate a metaphor within its proper historical context, his monograph is not concerned with the finer points of how metaphors work with both their historical contexts and their literary contexts to produce meaning.

1.2.2 Hermeneutical and Theological Approaches

Drawing upon insights from the ideology of patrilineal descent, Hodge in her monograph, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, proposes a unique hermeneutical solution for reading the Pauline occurrences of υἱοθεσία as Paul's ritualized reconstruction of gentile origins.[62] Hodge is primarily concerned with mapping Paul's ethnic identities, and she argues, "For Paul, ethnic identity is inextricable from a people's standing before God: the gentiles are who they are because they have rejected the God of Israel."[63] A key tenet to Hodge's overall project is that kinship and ethnic identities are based both on natural and essential bonds (shared blood, lineage, etc.), and are also "open to change and rearrangement."[64] Following Stanley Stowers and relying on "a text-based interpretation" which, in Hodge's assessment, indicates the letters were intended for an exclusively gentile audience, Hodge argues that the Pauline letters "are carefully

---

[58] Ibid., 135.
[59] Ibid., 136.
[60] Ibid., 137.
[61] See Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 1-8; 213-226; Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 121-265.
[62] Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 67-78.
[63] Ibid., 43.
[64] Ibid., 21.

constructed arguments addressed to gentile Christ-followers."[65] According to Hodge, one expressed purpose of Paul's letters is to create gentile origins and construct gentile identity using the logic of patrilineal descent. She asserts that Paul accomplishes this construction of a new ethnic identity through rituals, such as baptism, and by redefining the line of patrilineal descent for gentile Christ-followers on the basis of the faithful actions of Abraham and Christ.[66] Based on her reading of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors, Hodge concludes, "Romans 8:14-17 and Galatians 4:1-7 describe the same basic theory of kinship creation: Paul establishes a kinship for gentiles which is based not on shared blood, but on shared spirit."[67]

Unlike the monographs of Byrne, Scott, and Peppard, Hodge's approach to the υἱοθεσία metaphors consists primarily in her hermeneutical and rhetorical interests. However, from the outset of her monograph she assumes that υἱοθεσία draws upon the ideology of adoption and kinship formation seen in Greek and Roman adoption practices. Although Hodge argues, "[A]doption was known among Jews,"[68] she cites examples from Philo and Josephus, so her concept of "Jewish adoption" is quite different from both Byrne and Scott who wish to locate Jewish adoption practices in specific Old Testament texts. Despite Hodge's insistence that she does not rely on specific concepts of Greek, Roman, or Jewish adoption, but rather her premise rests on the assumption that "these cultures viewed adoption as a practical means of maintaining lineages,"[69] Hodge's concept of adoption is clearly indebted to Greco-Roman practices where the purpose of adoption was to legitimate an heir in the patrilineal descent.[70] Also telling is Hodge's brief treatment of how υἱοθεσία is functioning in Romans 9:4 in respect to the *Ioudaioi*, perhaps because of the difficulty Paul's use of υἱοθεσία there creates for her overall thesis regarding the construction of gentile ethnic identities through adoption. Although Hodge argues, "Israelite identity is rooted in the stories of their ancestors, the covenants, and the promises which established them as adopted sons of God," she does not adequately address how the Israelite adoption in Romans 9:4 may differ from the adoption of gentiles in Galatians 4:5 and Romans 8:15-23. Rather, she asserts that the adoption of these two

[65] Ibid., 10-11.
[66] Ibid., 79-91.
[67] Ibid., 77.
[68] Ibid., 31.
[69] Ibid.
[70] Hodge cites no example of a Jewish adoption where this kind of legitimation occurs.

groups maintains the ethnic distinctions between the gentiles and the *Ioudaioi*, and that these distinctions continue even "in Christ,"[71] though it is unclear how salient Hodge thinks these ethnic distinctions are in light of the Christ-event. However, Hodge's query regarding the function of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in the construction of identity for Paul's audience is an important area of research, and one that would surely benefit from interacting with research from other disciplines regarding the role of metaphor in group identity construction.[72]

Published in 2006, Burke's monograph aims to synthesize key exegetical insights from the Pauline adoption passages in order to delineate a comprehensive Pauline theology of adoption. Burke sees υἱοθεσία as an "organizing metaphor"[73] for salvation because it, "(1) centres in the person and work of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; (2) it shares a moral focus evident in other soteriological expressions in Paul's writings; and (3) it is eschatological in nature."[74] Although Burke argues that υἱοθεσία was a term Paul borrowed from the "Roman sociolegal context of his day," Burke also asserts that "we cannot separate the Jewish or Graeco-Roman cultural influences that impacted the apostle Paul," and thus the issue of the metaphor's Jewish or Greco-Roman background, in Burke's view, is a false dichotomy.[75] Drawing primarily on the Greco-Roman "sociolegal" understanding of adoption, Burke's study then outlines what he sees as "the trinitarian implications"[76] of the υἱοθεσία metaphor, including the role of God as '*abbā* Father,[77] the Christocentric importance of the Son,[78] and the personal and familial role of the Spirit in the believer's adoption.[79] From his analysis of these theological aspects of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in the Pauline corpus (Gal 4:5; Rom 8:15-23; Rom 9:4, Eph 1:5) Burke concludes, "*Huiothesia* is not only a theological but also a soteriological metaphor that underscores the subjective side of

[71] Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 48.
[72] This question will be taken up in section 3.2 of chapter 3.
[73] By "organizing" Burke means that the metaphor combines soteriological, moral, and eschatological elements into the single expression of adoption (*Adopted into God's Family*, 41).
[74] Ibid.
[75] Ibid., 194.
[76] Ibid., 31.
[77] Ibid., 72-99.
[78] Ibid., 100-124.
[79] Ibid., 125-51.

the believer's salvation,"[80] which draws its meaning from its setting in the ancient household and *familia*. [81]

At the outset of his monograph, Burke briefly discusses ancient and current understandings of metaphor, and concludes, "[T]he family in the ancient world, or more specifically the father-to-the-adopted-son relation, serves as the *source* domain or *donor* field, whereas the Christian's relationship to God is the *target* domain or the *recipient* field."[82] Burke presumably uses this schema of the source and target domain to analyze all of the occurrences of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in the Pauline corpus, though he never specifically refers to it again. Rather, Burke proceeds with the tacit assumption that these source and target domains underlie each occurrence of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphor, which I will show to be a problematic methodological assumption based on a more nuanced understanding of contemporary theories of metaphor. Contrary to Burke's rather simplistic overview, the first two chapters of this thesis will demonstrate that current theories of metaphor are diverse and nuanced, and analyzing a text using contemporary metaphor theory requires careful attention to questions of how metaphors work to create meaning for their hearers.

The monographs devoted to explicating the background of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors have contributed significantly to their understanding by mapping out various influences which may have contributed to the metaphors' meaning for Paul's audience members. Likewise, Burke and Hodge's monographs have raised interesting exegetical and hermeneutical questions regarding the significance of these metaphors within their settings in the Pauline corpus. However, no study has been seriously undertaken which treats the question of how to read and analyze the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors as metaphors. In order to understand the meaning of these metaphors, they must be analyzed using a well-developed and rigorous theory of metaphor that includes a more nuanced understanding of how metaphorical meaning is produced, and what effects metaphors have on their audience. This is the task that will be undertaken in the remainder of this thesis.

---

[80] Ibid., 194.
[81] Ibid.
[82] Ibid., 34.

2. The Scope of This Project

The two chief purposes of this study are (1) to develop and defend a robust hermeneutical approach to reading metaphors in the biblical text, and (2) to utilize this methodology to glean new exegetical insights from a fresh reading of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors. The methodology I put forth is intentionally eclectic, drawing on philosophical approaches to metaphor and language and on insights from cognitive linguistics, communication studies, and anthropology. Rarely have these disciplines been merged within a single methodology, but I maintain that these areas complement each other and each bring distinct benefits to the hermeneutical process. Since the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors are embedded in texts, the emphasis on textuality found in many philosophical and literary approaches to metaphor allows for a rigorous hermeneutic that identifies specific features of the texts in which the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors occur. These features include a delineation of the metaphorical utterance and its frame, the identification of the metaphor's tenor and vehicle, and the likely level of emphasis and resonance based on its presentation in the text.[83] Moreover, hermeneutical advances in intertextuality will be combined with philosophical and literary approaches to metaphor in order to carefully consider how metaphors function in intertextual relationships. Because in Romans 9:4 the υἱοθεσία metaphor is predicated of the Israelites, this question regarding intertextuality is of preeminent importance for understanding its impact, yet interpreters thus far have overlooked its significance in their exegesis. The precision of the delineations achievable through philosophical and literary approaches to metaphor allow the interpreter to pinpoint and map the components of the various Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors, thereby drawing attention to the similarities and differences which exist in their setting, structure, and implications.

Moreover, the groundwork laid by a methodologically rigorous approach to a metaphor's textual features provides an avenue for further inquiry regarding its impact on extra-textual features such as perception, emotion, and group identity formation. Since the Pauline texts were written to specific audiences, it is not enough to attend to the textual features of the metaphors; one must also consider the reception of these metaphors by the Pauline audiences. To be sure, one of the chief difficulties in assessing the impact of the extra-textual elements of the υἱοθεσία metaphors is the

[83] These terms will be discussed in detail in chapter 2.

lack of access to the original audience of the text. However, studies in cognitive linguistics and communication have demonstrated that metaphors possess a powerful capacity to influence the perceptions and attitudes of their intended audiences, and thus can be highly effective tools for shaping group identity. Therefore, a fully-orbed hermeneutical approach to the υἱοθεσία metaphors must incorporate these insights in order to address questions regarding the impact of the various υἱοθεσία metaphors on their audiences.

It also is beneficial at the outset to delineate several topics this study does not address. First, this study is not an attempt to rule out various "backgrounds" of the υἱοθεσία metaphors. Several monographs have already been devoted to identifying and describing the various possible backgrounds of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors, and it is not within the purview of this study to build significantly upon this work.[84] Moreover, as I will show through arguments regarding the relationship between metaphor and model, attempting to eliminate any of the proposed backgrounds of the υἱοθεσία metaphor emerges from a misguided understanding of the relationship between metaphors and their underlying models. Rather, I argue that a plurality of models is appropriate for the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors because it is likely that individual members of Paul's audience would have been familiar with one or all of them. However, I will evaluate the likelihood of each υἱοθεσία metaphor evoking each of the three proposed models based on the surrounding literary context and on considerations regarding the makeup of Paul's audience, and show that certain υἱοθεσία metaphors are more likely to evoke a Greek or Roman model of adoption, and at least one υἱοθεσία metaphor (Rom 9:4) likely draws the model of Jewish sonship firmly into view.

Furthermore, this study does not attempt to propose a univocal meaning for "the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphor," but rather shows that the four Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors function much like the bands of color which occur when white light is passed through a prism. Their meanings exist as part of the same spectrum, but they remain discrete parts of the composite whole. As I show in the discussion on methodology, the meaning of metaphors occurs at the level of a complete utterance rather than with an individual word or lexeme. Moreover, changes to the frame of a

[84] However, the three proposed backgrounds will each be discussed and evaluated as a potential underlying model for the υἱοθεσία metaphors in chapter 4.

metaphor result in differences in metaphorical meaning. I have already spoken of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors, rather than the singular Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphor; this distinction is intentional. This study treats each of the υἱοθεσία metaphors as a separate utterance capable of producing variations in meaning, and holds these meanings in tension rather than attempting to synthesize them into a single "meaning" for υἱοθεσία in the Pauline text. However, this is not to say that the synthesis of the υἱοθεσία metaphors into more comprehensive theological categories such as their soteriological implications, eschatological implications, ecclesiological implications, or anthropological implications is impossible or even undesirable. Rather, what this study's proposed methodology shows is that this synthesis is a step beyond the exegesis of the individual metaphors, and must be derived from first considering their meanings as discrete utterances. Such a synthetic endeavor, unfortunately, falls outside the purview of this study, but it is certainly a viable avenue for further research.

Although several monographs on the υἱοθεσία metaphors have argued that the Pauline uses of υἱοθεσία must be read in light of the adoption of Christ as the Son,[85] this study does not attempt to investigate the purported adoption of Christ in relation to the Pauline uses of υἱοθεσία for several reasons. First, and most significantly, Paul does not use the vocabulary of υἱοθεσία or any term from the same semantic domain to metaphorically describe Christ's sonship anywhere in Romans or Galatians, and most certainly not in the passages (or frames) where the υἱοθεσία metaphors occur. Instead, Paul reserves the term πρωτότοκος for Christ in Romans 8:29, and in Galatians 4:4 he simply refers to Christ as "the Son" (υἱός). Although Peppard is correct in stating that πρωτότοκος "does not necessarily designate begotten sonship,"[86] neither does the term explicitly connote adoptive sonship. Peppard is correct in his assessment that "firstborn" denotes the place and privilege of a son rather than primogeniture,[87] but Peppard's further claim that Paul's audience would have undoubtedly seen their own adoption as wrapped up in the adoption of the Son is not warranted by the context of the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 nor in Galatians 4.[88] Nor is Scott's claim convincing when he argues that Romans 1:4a "is a

[85] See Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 223-43; Peppard, *The Son of God*, 137-40.
[86] Peppard, *The Son of God*, 139.
[87] Ibid.
[88] See ibid., 139-40.

circumlocution for the Adoption Formula in 2 Sam. 7:14a," since there are significant differences in vocabulary between these two passages. Moreover, Paul's designation of Christ as τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει in Romans 1:4a does not contain significant overlaps with the vocabulary Paul uses to metaphorically describe the sonship of believers in Romans 8 (most notably ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας). This is further confirmed by the lack of a specific designation of Christ as the adopted son in close proximity to the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 8, and in Paul's preference for other terms of sonship in regard to Christ in Romans 8:15-39 (e.g. πρωτότοκος, τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ). Furthermore, there is no indication that Paul views Christ's sonship as specifically adoptive sonship in Galatians, nevertheless Paul utilizes a υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 to metaphorically describe the sonship of the Galatian believers. If Paul wished to stress the importance of the link between Christ's sonship and the sonship of believers as sonship by *adoption* in particular, it is peculiar that he did not connect them more specifically in the context of any of his υἱοθεσία metaphors. Therefore, because the adoption of believers is not explicitly linked with the adoption of Christ in any of the passages where υἱοθεσία metaphors occur, this study does not address the issue of Christ's adoption in connection with the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors.

The final preliminary issue that must be addressed before this study can proceed is the difficulty of gender-inclusivity, metaphor, and translation. Many scholars have noted that υἱοθεσία unequivocally refers to the adoption of males, and many argue that the most faithful translation is therefore "adoption as sons."[89] This translation is further supported by a wealth of inscriptional evidence that preserves θυγατροθεσία as the preferred designation for the adoption of daughters,[90] with τεκνοθεσία also occasionally used to describe the adoption of women.[91] Given the gender-specificity of υἱοθεσία, it is unlikely that Paul's original audience would have understood the meaning of the word to be anything other than "adoption as sons." In an effort to preserve the link between the Pauline metaphor and its underlying models

[89] See e.g. Corley's extended treatment of the issue in "Women's Inheritance Rights," 98-121; also Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, xiv; Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*, 21 n. 2.
[90] See e.g. Andreas Victor Walser, "ΘΥΓΑΤΡΟΘΕΣΙΑ – Ein Neues Zeignis aus Kaunos für die Adoption von Frauen," *EA* 37 (2004): 101-106.
[91] Corley, "Women's Inheritance Rights," 99.

of adoption and sonship, I will proceed with the assumption that the term is gender-specific and use the translation "adoption as sons."

However, as I show in the methodological portion of the thesis, the gender-specific meaning of υἱοθεσία does not necessarily lead to a gender-exclusive metaphor. Paul uses gender-specific language of himself when he invokes the imagery of a nursing mother to metaphorically describe his behavior to the Thessalonians (1 Thess 2:7) and the Corinthians (1 Cor 3:1-3a), and this surely does not imply in any way that Paul thought of himself as anatomically or ontologically female. Moreover, Corley points out that the masculine κληρονόμος was used of both men and women, despite the term being unambiguously masculine in gender.[92] In the context of both Romans and Galatians it is clear that Paul does not intend υἱοθεσία to exclude the female members of his audiences (e.g. Gal 3:28), and it is also clear that he is using υἱοθεσία metaphorically, which makes its application akin to Paul's use of female imagery to metaphorically describe his ministry to the churches in Thessalonica and Corinth. However, it must also be said that although υἱοθεσία is being used metaphorically and therefore does not exclude the women in Paul's audience from participating in adoption, Corley's assertion that a woman "must have maleness conferred on her before she can be made a son" is also apt.[93] There is undoubtedly room for critique of the patriarchal values that underlie Paul's imagery in his υἱοθεσία metaphors, which denied women equal access to inheritance and the ability to adopt heirs themselves. However, in order to best situate the υἱοθεσία metaphors within their first-century context and to best understand their impact on Paul's audiences, they must be viewed in light of the patriarchal system from which they are drawn – even though it means that a woman in Paul's audience, as Corley points out, "must take an additional step up the hierarchical ladder" in order to experience the metaphor in its fullness.[94]

3. Overview of Chapters

This study is divided into two major sections, placing an equal emphasis on methodology and exegesis. The first section of the thesis (chapters 2-4) addresses three complementary areas of methodological inquiry, and the second section of the

[92] Ibid., 117-19.
[93] Ibid., 121.
[94] Ibid.

thesis (chapters 5-7) presents an exegetical analysis of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors using the categories outlined in section 1.

In the first part of the thesis, chapter 2 examines the question, "What are metaphors?" using insights primarily from philosophical studies on the nature of metaphorical language. After examining several competing contemporary theories of metaphor, this chapter defends the merits of Soskice's definition of a metaphor as particularly well-suited to the study of the biblical text. This chapter also identifies and outlines several key components of metaphor that are important for exegetical inquiry: frame, model, tenor, vehicle, emphasis, and resonance. Complementing the material in the second chapter, chapter 3 examines the question "What do metaphors do?" using insights from cognitive linguistics, anthropology, and research in rhetoric and communication. Drawing upon current research from these diverse fields, this chapter argues that metaphors have the capacity to profoundly influence the perceptions and emotions of their audience members, creating bonds between audience members and boundaries around group identity. Completing the first section of the thesis, chapter 4 is devoted to an examination of three proposed models which underlie the υἱοθεσία metaphors: Jewish sonship, Greek adoption practices, and Roman adoption practices, since these three models were likely the most familiar to Paul's audience.

In the second part of the thesis, chapter 5 utilizes the methodology developed in the previous chapters to exegete the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5. Here I argue that Paul utilizes the υἱοθεσία metaphor to shape the audience's perception of God's mission (Father, Son, and Spirit) to be viewed in terms of sonship and inheritance, and that Paul appeals to the Galatians' experience of the Spirit as the foundation for the cognitive framework created by the metaphor. Chapter 6 examines the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8:15-23, arguing that these metaphors form a diptych that highlights the eschatological tension between the present age and the age to come. By drawing attention to their temporal displacement, the two υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 solidify the bonds between Paul's audience members formed around their shared experience of existential tension and suffering. Chapter 7 considers the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4, paying particular attention to the relationship between the Pauline metaphor and the intertextual relationships evoked through the underlying models. Rather than drawing upon a traditional designation for Israel, I argue that Paul's use of υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4 reframes and reinterprets key

elements of Israel's history and Scripture through the framework of adoption. This reframing creates a shared vision of Israel among Paul's Jewish and gentile audience members, for whom, through the use of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4, Paul cultivates an empathic concern for the Israelites as God's chosen people among his Christ-following audience. In chapter 8, the conclusion surveys several of the major contributions my methodology makes to the exegesis of the υἱοθεσία metaphors and suggests several avenues for future research. In addition, the conclusion briefly addresses the use of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors in the 21st-century context of current western adoption practices, and highlights the importance of understanding the connection between metaphor and perception for developing a responsible narrative for the Christian adoption and orphan care movement.

II. A WORKING THEORY OF METAPHOR

1. INTRODUCTION

Although there have been numerous studies published on the background and interpretation of Pauline metaphors, no study has ventured far into contemporary metaphor theory to aid in the exegetical process. To be sure, the sheer quantity of literature that has been produced by various disciplines regarding the nature and function of metaphor seems daunting, but this research provides biblical scholars with important tools for exegesis and interpretation. Moreover, even the label "contemporary metaphor theory" is a misnomer, as there are many areas of current research that have developed their own theories of what metaphors are and how they function. Areas such as cognitive linguistics, philosophy of language, communication, and anthropology do not necessarily draw upon the work of other fields, but all of these fields have produced research on metaphor that is relevant to the study of metaphors in the biblical text. For biblical studies the two most influential bodies of literature on metaphor come from philosophical approaches to metaphor and cognitive studies on metaphor. However, these two areas of metaphor research are not often integrated into an approach to the exegesis of biblical metaphors. One primary aim of this study is to combine insights from philosophical approaches to metaphor that focus primarily on what metaphors "are" with insights from cognitive linguistics that focus primarily on what metaphors "do," as both of these modes of inquiry are useful for the exegesis of the biblical text. Therefore, the present chapter is devoted to the relevant textual and philosophical matters that arise from metaphor as a literary phenomenon, and the following chapter draws on insights from fields that approach metaphor from a practical standpoint.

Philosophers of language approach metaphors as a feature of language use and focus their discussion and field of inquiry tightly around metaphor and text. This tight focus on metaphor as a literary phenomenon is particularly helpful in treating biblical metaphors, which are, of course, features of biblical texts. However, this immediately raises questions about the role of the author and audience in the reading of the text,

and even more fundamentally, of what constitutes a text.[1] At times, biblical interpreters have assumed that reading metaphors is a straightforward, simplistic process,[2] but even a cursory reading of the debate surrounding metaphor theory among philosophers of language shows that the interpretation of a metaphor is anything but straightforward. If biblical scholars are to appreciate the complexities of biblical metaphors, then their exegesis must also be founded upon a theory of metaphor that is both philosophically sound and exegetically useful. The aims of this chapter are twofold: (1) to briefly survey the most viable options for a theory of metaphor that is workable and useful for biblical exegesis and (2) to address several preliminary issues that arise from drawing on metaphor theory for the exegetical process. In first section of the chapter, I endeavor to define relevant linguistic and philosophical terms and will focus specifically on the theories put forth by Black and Soskice. The second section will address practical issues that arise as a result of combining metaphor theory with biblical exegesis, such as: (1) the connections between metaphor, context, and intertextuality (2) the indeterminacy of metaphorical meaning, and (3) the connection between metaphor and reference.

2. Metaphor: A Working Definition

Within philosophical circles, agreeing upon a definition for "metaphor" is a notoriously difficult problem. However, the difficulty in defining precisely what a metaphor is does not necessary equate to difficulty in identifying a metaphor. Booth remarks that he and his students "have so far not found any one definition of metaphor that we all could possibly agree on. But we have found innumerable instances of what all of us happily call metaphors regardless of our definition."[3]

---

[1] The term "text" is especially debated in regard to intertextual inquiry and methodologies, and this issue will be discussed in more detail in section 3.1 below; see also Hennig Tegtmeyer, "Der Begriff der Intertextualität und seine Fassungen: Eine Kritik der Intertextualitätskonzepte Julia Kristevas und Susanne Holthuis," in *Textbeziehungen: linguistische und literaturwissenschaftliche Beiträge zur Intertextualität*, ed. Josef Klein (Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 1997), 49; Susanne Holthuis, *Intertextualität*: *Aspekte einer rezeptionsorientierten Konzeption* (Stauffenburg Colloquium 28, Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 1993), 1-28, 51-53.

[2] For example, the debate surrounding the meaning of κεφαλή in Ephesians 5:23 is often framed as either denoting "source" or "authority." Both sides of the debate assume that the metaphorical use of a word in various contexts can be reduced to a single meaning; e.g. Catherine Clark Kroeger, "The Classical Concept of 'Head' as 'Source,'" in *Equal to Serve*, ed. Gretchen Gaebelein Hull (London: Scripture Union, 1987), 267-83; Wayne Grudem, "Does κεφαλή ('Head') Mean 'Source' or 'Authority Over' in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2336 Examples," *Trinity Journal* 6 (1985): 38-59; idem, "The Meaning of κεφαλή ('Head'): A Response to Recent Studies," *Trinity Journal* 11 (1990): 3-72.

[3] Booth, "Metaphor as Rhetoric," 49.

Given the complexity of the debate, it is beyond the purview of this study to posit yet another definition for metaphor or to give an exhaustive list of criteria for their identification.[4] Rather, my purpose here is to evaluate and apply the advances in metaphor theory put forth by philosophers of language to the task of biblical exegesis of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors. What is needed for the task at hand, then, is a *working definition* of metaphor chosen for the explanatory power it brings to the process of exegesis, and as such this study relies upon Soskice's carefully reasoned definition of a metaphor as "that figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another."[5] The following section begins by providing a brief overview and critique of several competing theories of metaphor, and then proceeds with a defense of Soskice's definition and its usefulness for biblical exegesis. Since my focus is exegetical rather than philosophical, I do not mean to offer here a comprehensive case for the merits of Soskice's definition; such an endeavor is well outside of the purview of this study. Rather, what follows is an introductory explanation of contemporary metaphor theories in philosophy of language that gives due credence to the philosophical debate, but also functions as the point of departure for the more practical task of biblical interpretation in the second part of the thesis.

2.1 Substitution or Comparison Theories

Any discussion of the origins of a formal account of metaphor usually begins with Aristotle, who in his *Poetics* says, "Metaphor consists in giving the thing a name that belongs to something else; the transference being either from genus to species, or from species to genus, or from species to species, or on grounds of analogy" (*Poetics* 1457b 6-9). At first blush, Aristotle's definition seems both useful and straightforward, however upon further examination it is doubtful that current philosophers of language would classify some of Aristotle's examples as metaphors at all.[6] Furthermore, it is important to note that Aristotle's explanation of metaphor tends

---

[4] Several good examples of definitions and criteria for identification include: Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15-23; John R. Searle, "Metaphor," in *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed., ed. Andrew Ortony (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 83-108; Peter Macky, *The Centrality of Metaphors to Biblical Thought: A Method for Interpreting the Bible* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990), 31-56.

[5] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15.

[6] Soskice observes, "The first two of Aristotle's types of transfer…pick out what is customarily regarded as the separate trope of synecdoche" (ibid., 5); see also Paul Ricoeur, "for Aristotle the word

to confine it to an attribute of an individual word, rather than a phrase or a sentence.[7] As we shall see, such a limitation has vast implications for any theory of metaphor, and especially for the application of such a theory to the interpretation of biblical texts, where the surrounding context must be recognized as equally important to a metaphor's interpretation.

Next to Aristotle, Quintilian's writings on metaphor have enjoyed the most influence on contemporary theories of metaphor. Though his theory is perhaps more oriented towards praxis and is typically considered less developed than Aristotle's, Quintilian nevertheless made a significant contribution to the understanding of metaphor in his *Institutio Oratoria*. Certainly his oft-quoted adage, "*In totum autem metaphora brevior est similitudo*,"[8] has contributed a great deal to later comparison theories of metaphor. However, Quintilian's aim was to explain the connection between metaphor and rhetoric, not to develop a sophisticated linguistic or philosophical account of metaphor, and neither Aristotle's nor Quintilian's definitions should be judged according to the criteria of later theories.

Though neither Aristotle nor Quintilian set out to write a purely philosophical defense of the nature of metaphor, their writing has given rise to contemporary comparison theories,[9] which assert that there is a suitable literal paraphrase in the form of a comparison for every metaphorical utterance. Thus, "Juliet is the sun," has as its paraphrase "Juliet is like the sun," and so forth. To be sure, the ease of identifying the underlying simile in a metaphorical utterance varies from metaphor to metaphor. For example, it is much more difficult to find a literal paraphrase for Picasso's "Art washes from the soul the dust of everyday life." Perhaps we could say something like "Art removes the trivial things of everyday life like water removes dust from a surface"? As seen in these paraphrases, the trouble with comparison theories is that everything turns out to be "like" everything in ways that are often vapid and trivial.[10] Furthermore, in speaking of comparison theories, Black shrewdly

---

metaphor applies to every transposition of terms" (*The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language*, trans. Robert Czerny, [London: Routledge, 1978], 17).

[7] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 5.

[8] "On the whole, metaphor is a shorter form of simile," Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* VIII.vi.8.

[9] Black remarks, "It will be noticed that a 'comparison view' is a special case of a 'substitution view.' For it holds that the metaphorical statement might be replaced by an equivalent literal *comparison*" ("More About Metaphor," 35 [emph. orig.]).

[10] Donald Davidson, "What Metaphors Mean," in *The Philosophy of Language*, 5th ed., ed. A. P. Martinich (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 478.

observes, "The danger of an approach that treats literal utterance as an unproblematic standard, while regarding metaphorical utterance as problematic or mysterious by contrast, is that it tends to encourage reductionist theories."[11] The literal paraphrases offered do not actually address how a metaphor functions within a text as a figure of speech, but rather they substitute one figure of speech (a simile) for another (the original metaphor). Despite the creation of a literal paraphrase, questions regarding the metaphor's meaning and function remain.

Regardless of the fact that substitution and comparison theories of metaphor have largely fallen out of favor in philosophical circles, the definitions of metaphor put forth by Aristotle and Quintilian have been accepted rather uncritically by many biblical scholars as a suitable starting point for exegesis.[12] Perhaps this is due to the proximity of Aristotle's writings to the biblical text in comparison to contemporary theories, which at first seems to be a valid reason for applying an ancient, rather than current, theory of metaphor.[13] However, it is important to note that "Aristotle was not concerned to give accounts of mechanisms and processes, but simply wished to provide his reader with an identifying description of metaphor"[14] for the improvement of style, which means that Aristotle's theory does little to aid in the task of

---

[11] Black, "More About Metaphor," 22.

[12] Soskice remarks that among philosophers of language, "It is by now almost a commonplace that Aristotle is the originator and Quintilian the exponent of the clearly unsatisfactory view that metaphor is simply the substitution of a decorative word or phrase for an ordinary one" (*Metaphor and Religious Language*, 8). Sadly, the developments in metaphor theory that have led to the abandonment of substitution and comparison theories have not been widely utilized by biblical scholars (e.g. Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*). Though Burke mentions Lakoff and Johnson's theory of metaphor in addition to citing Aristotle's definition, contemporary metaphor theory does not figure in his exegesis of the metaphorical texts; so also Vanhoozer, though recognizing that "we need to respect the *irreducibility* of metaphor" (*Is There a Meaning in This Text?: The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998], 129 [emph. orig.]), argues elsewhere that what meaning can be derived from metaphor occurs when "a metaphor is successfully interpreted…unpacked, [and] translated into literal speech" (ibid., 128).

[13] There is a similar debate surrounding the use of ancient rhetoric or contemporary rhetoric for the analysis of biblical texts. However, ancient rhetoric was much more highly developed than ancient metaphor theory, and consequently biblical scholars who seek to employ ancient rhetorical categories to biblical texts have a large amount of raw material at their disposal. For arguments in support of using ancient rhetoric see Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians* (Hermeneia, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 14-25; David DeSilva, *Seeing Things John's Way: The Rhetoric of the Book of Revelation* (Louisville: WJK, 2009), 14-40; Ben Witherington III, *New Testament Rhetoric: An Introductory Guide to the Art of Persuasion in and of the New Testament* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2009), 5-18; for arguments for the use of contemporary rhetoric, see Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians," *NTS* 33 (1987): 386-403; John A. Darr, *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization* (JSNTSup 163, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998); Jeffrey Staley, *The Print's First Kiss: A Rhetorical Investigation of the Implied Reader in the Fourth Gospel* (SBLDS 82, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

[14] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 9.

understanding the mechanism of metaphor. With this in mind, if we are to undertake the task of determining how biblical metaphors function to create meaning within the text, then it is wise to look beyond Aristotle and his followers for a theory that deals with a metaphor's mechanism for creating meaning rather than its stylistic purpose. As Black observes, "Looking at a scene through blue spectacles is different from *comparing* that scene with something else."[15] Moreover, Black's insistence that metaphors are not reducible to a literal comparison is indicative of the trend among philosophers of language and cognitive linguists to view metaphors as cognitive instruments capable of changing the structure and shape of a person's thoughts.[16] Thus in moving beyond comparison views we are free to entertain theories that explore how metaphors create and color our perception of their subject.

2.2. Contemporary Theories of Metaphor

Though some deprecators of metaphor maintain the validity of comparison theories, seeing metaphor as "a sort of happy extra trick with words,"[17] or perhaps even more negatively, argue that metaphors serve no further function "but to insinuate wrong *ideas*, move the passions, and thereby mislead the judgment,"[18] most contemporary theorists have left comparison and substitution theories behind in favor of more robust theories. Furthermore, discussion continues among philosophers and linguists as to the validity and merits of new theories, so this study adopts a "working theory of metaphor" and from that theory a "working definition of metaphor," recognizing that the conversation regarding the nature and function of metaphor is far from ended. This section examines the theories of two different philosophers whose categories are utilized in the exegetical portion of this study—Black and Soskice—and offer a defense of Soskice's definition as particularly well-suited to the exegetical task.

---

[15] Black, "More About Metaphor," 30.

[16] More will be said about the connection between texts and readers in section 3 below. For a full discussion on metaphor and perception see section 2.1 of chapter 3.

[17] Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 90. N.b. Richards himself does not subscribe to such a sentiment.

[18] John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, bk. III, chap. 10; For a good summary and critique of Locke's and Hobbes' view of metaphor see Klaus Müller-Richter, and Arturo Larcati, *Kampf der Metapher!* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophish-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 634, Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996), 98-107.

2.2.1. Max Black's Interaction Theory

Black's "interaction theory" is still recognized as one of the first satisfactory attempts to explain metaphor as a non-ornamental feature of language with the capacity to influence cognition and perception.[19] Unlike comparison and substitution theories, theories like Black's assert that "what is said by the metaphor can be expressed adequately in no other way, that the combination of parts in a metaphor can produce new and unique agents of meaning."[20] Black himself sees his theory as "a help to understanding how strong metaphorical statements *work*."[21] Rather than seeing a metaphor as mere ornamentation describing its underlying subject, and thus reducible to a literal paraphrase, Black argues that all metaphorical statements have a primary and a secondary subject that interact in order to create and unveil meaning for the hearer/reader.[22] As a result of ongoing discussions with other philosophers of language, Black revised his interaction theory a number of times throughout the course of his career. I will draw on his final version of the theory because of its clarifying remarks regarding a metaphor's primary and secondary subjects. Within any given metaphor, Black sees the primary and secondary subjects interacting in the following ways:

> (a) the presence of the primary subject incites the hearer to select some of the secondary subject's properties; and (b) invites him to construct a parallel implication-complex that can fit the primary subject; and (c) reciprocally induce parallel changes in the secondary subject.[23]

Thus, in using Black's example, " Marriage is a zero-sum game,"[24] the primary subject – "marriage"—interacts with the secondary subject—"a zero-sum game"—to produce an "implication complex supported by the secondary subject."[25] Black also suggests that the secondary subject "is to be regarded as a system rather than an individual thing."[26] It is important to note that in Black's view, it is the combination

[19] Black, "More About Metaphor," 38.
[20] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 31.
[21] Black, "More About Metaphor," 27 (emph. orig.).
[22] Ibid., 35-38.
[23] Ibid., 28.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Ibid., 30.
[26] Ibid., 28.

or the "interaction" between the two subjects that constitutes the metaphor, and for Black this interaction is a cognitive event in the minds of the speaker and hearer.[27]

Much of Black's theory hangs on his insistence that in a given metaphor "at least one word…is being used metaphorically in the sentence, and that at least one of the remaining words is being used literally."[28] Black terms the word being used metaphorically the "focus," and the remainder of the metaphor the "frame."[29] Thus in Black's example, "The chairman plowed through the discussion," the focus is "plowed" and the remainder of the sentence constitutes its frame.[30] Though it is somewhat problematic for Black to speak of a single word as "being used metaphorically,"[31] he does make the rather helpful observation that "differences in the…frames will produce *some* differences in the interplay between focus and frame."[32] Thus for Black it is the combination of the focus and frame that results in a particular metaphor with a unique set of implications. This is an important insight for the study of biblical metaphor, as the context or "frame" of a metaphor is never identical, and thus an interpreter should not expect that a "focus" appearing in several texts—"frames" in Black's terminology—will yield identical implications for each context.

To illustrate this, Paul uses δοῦλος of himself in Romans 1:1 (Παῦλος δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ)[33] and also to describe the former state of the audience in Romans 6:17 (ἦτε δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας).[34] Although the focus is the same in both instances, the frames evoke slightly different sets of implications: the latter instance connotes, among other things, a greater degree of passivity than the former, and certainly the

---

[27] Black asserts, "Although I speak figuratively here of the *subjects* interacting, such an outcome is of course produced in the minds of the speaker and hearer: It is they who are led to engage in selecting, organizing, and projecting" ("More About Metaphor," 28).
[28] Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 28.
[29] Ibid., 28.
[30] Ibid., 27-28.
[31] Soskice notes this in her critique of Black, stating "When [Black] speaks of the 'focus' of a metaphor as the 'words used metaphorically,' he displays the tendency…of regarding only certain words in an utterance as metaphorical rather than seeing that the metaphor is the product of the whole" (*Metaphor and Religious Language*, 46). While Soskice's critique is certainly valid in regard to the relationship of metaphor and lexeme, Black's insistence that a change in frame results in a different metaphor is nevertheless an important contribution to metaphor theory.
[32] Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 28.
[33] Paul, a δοῦλος (slave/servant) of Christ Jesus.
[34] You were once δοῦλοι (slaves) of sin.

former implies a position of privilege for Paul.[35] Therefore, in interpreting biblical metaphor we cannot speak of a single meaning for a given metaphorical focus (slavery, redemption, adoption, and so on) but rather we must consider the interplay between the focus and the frame – the whole metaphorical utterance – to determine the range of implications for each metaphor.

2.2.2 Emphatic and Resonant Metaphors

Though they are not typically treated as an integral part of his theory, Black's criteria for what he terms "strong" metaphors are helpful tools for analyzing and interpreting metaphors found in the biblical text. Black argues that strong metaphors have both *emphasis* and *resonance*, whereas weak metaphors "might be compared to an unfunny joke."[36] Black defines a metaphor as emphatic "to the degree that its producer will allow no variation upon or substitute for the words used," and further says, "Emphatic metaphors are intended to be dwelt upon for the sake of their unstated implications."[37] As a counterpart to "emphatic," Black defines resonant metaphors as "utterances that support a high degree of implicative elaboration."[38] Therefore, in Black's theory, the stronger the metaphor, the more likely the hearer/reader is to be struck by the juxtaposition of its two subjects and the more likely he or she is to contemplate its implication-complex.

These two categories, *emphasis* and *resonance*, are quite helpful in evaluating the impact of a metaphor in the biblical text that is chronologically distant from the contemporary interpreter. Through lexical analysis it is possible to determine whether a metaphor would have been received by the audience as both emphatic and resonant, and thus a "strong" metaphor, or likewise, if a metaphor was relatively weak at the time the biblical text was written. According to Black's theory, if a metaphor is found to be strong, then it should be treated as having a broader range of possible meanings due to its resonance, and thus be regarded as theologically significant by virtue of being emphatic. As I will show in chapter 4, the lexical data on υἱοθεσία indicates

[35] Paul's use of enslavement language in the context of the υἱοθεσία metaphors is treated in chapters 5 and 6.
[36] Black, "More About Metaphor," 26.
[37] Ibid.
[38] Ibid.

that the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors were likely both resonant and emphatic, or in Black's terminology, strong metaphors.[39]

2.2.3 Weaknesses of the Interaction Theory

Though Black's theory has much to commend it, there are several inadequacies that render parts of it less suitable for the task of biblical exegesis. First, Black's theory relies on the interaction between two distinct subjects in a metaphor and sees only one of these subjects as having "metaphorical meaning."[40] Thus, in Black's theory metaphorical meaning is located at the level of the individual lexeme rather than at the level of a complete phrase or utterance. This proves to be problematic because, as Black himself admits, metaphors are by nature indeterminate in their meaning.[41] It follows then that under Black's theory the meaning of a word, which Black takes to be the locus of the metaphor, is also indeterminate, but this is demonstrably false. Taking Black's example, "Man is a wolf," Black sees the lexeme "wolf" as having a metaphorical meaning surrounded by the literal frame. Upon closer examination however, the lexeme "wolf" does not mean something other than "large, predatory canine." Rather, both "man" and "wolf" retain their conventional, non-metaphorical meanings,[42] and the "meaning" of the metaphor occurs at the level of the complete utterance "Man is a wolf." This is a helpful distinction to make when dealing with the υἱοθεσία metaphor in the biblical texts, as it guards against notions of a single "metaphorical meaning" for υἱοθεσία and maintains a tight focus on the literary context of the complete metaphorical utterance in which υἱοθεσία occurs.

Soskice also criticizes Black for his "continued insistence that each metaphor has two distinct subjects."[43] She argues that Black's interaction theory only works for metaphors that appear in the familiar for "X is a Y," or Black's "Man is a wolf," or "Marriage is a zero-sum game."[44] However, metaphors are not restricted to the syntactic form, "X is a Y," and Soskice notes that Black's theory has difficulty describing the interaction between metaphors such as "a writhing script" or "blossoms

---

[39] The lexical data is treated in chapter 4.
[40] Black, "More About Metaphor," 27.
[41] Ibid., 25.
[42] This is precisely Davidson's objection, "It is no help in explaining how words work in metaphor to posit metaphorical or figurative meanings" ("What Metaphors Mean," 474).
[43] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 43.
[44] Ibid., 20; Black, "More About Metaphor," 20, 28.

of smoke,"[45] because these metaphors lack two distinct subjects. She concludes, "To eliminate instances like these because they lack two explicit subjects would be to eliminate most of what we take to be metaphor."[46] So too then, Black's theory would seemingly eliminate several instances of Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors from consideration, as they also lack two distinct subjects. Certainly Paul's statement in Romans 8:23, "ἡμεῖς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι" does not lend itself easily to analysis under Black's theory, as υἱοθεσίαν is the direct object of a transitive verb, rather than something predicated of the subject. This also occurs in Galatians 4:5 where υἱοθεσίαν is again the direct object, and furthermore it occurs as part of a conditional clause. Indeed, in each case of a Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphor, it is difficult to formulate precisely what the two subjects of the metaphor would be under Black's theory. For example, in Romans 8:15 Paul states, "ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας," which again lacks two distinct subjects. Perhaps it is possible, under Black's theory, to identify the primary subject of the metaphor as a certain unstated *X* which "you (pl.)," are receiving (ἐλάβετε), which is interacting with "υἱοθεσίαν" (the stated "secondary subject") to create metaphorical meaning. But the value of that "*X*" is ultimately unknown, and Black's theory provides no clarity as to what two subjects are then actually interacting to produce the metaphor. Furthermore, if we attempt to posit a value for the unknown "*X*," Black's theory quickly devolves into a comparison between the unknown "*X*" and "υἱοθεσία."[47] To avoid this difficulty, rather than speaking of a metaphor having two distinct subjects that interact, this study will speak of a metaphor having a single subject whose meaning is *interanimated* at the level of a complete utterance, which is comprised of a tenor and a vehicle.[48]

2.3 Janet Martin Soskice: An Interanimation Theory of Metaphor

Having already examined the inadequacies of comparison and substitution theories, and elucidated several of the difficulties with Black's interaction theory, we turn now to a theory that attempts to appreciate a metaphor's unique ability to give

---

[45] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 20-21.
[46] Ibid., 20.
[47] See Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 20; 42-43 for a further discussion of this problem.
[48] The terms "tenor" and "vehicle," coined by Richards, will be discussed in more detail below; see also Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 99-112.

the reader "two ideas for one,"[49] without speaking of a metaphor as having two distinct subjects. Soskice defines a metaphor as "that figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another," and from this definition we can address: (1) how a metaphor gives us its two (or more) "ideas" in a single utterance (2) the underlying models associated with these "ideas" and (3) how a metaphor's two (or more) "ideas" come together to produce its metaphorical meaning.[50] These components of metaphorical meaning are lucidly explained and defined in a version of I. A. Richard's "interanimation theory" put forth by Soskice.[51]

Central to Richard's theory of metaphor is his insistence that individual word meanings are not "fixed factors with which [the author] has to build up the meaning of his sentences as a mosaic is put together of discrete independent tesserae. Instead, they are resultants which we arrive at only through the interplay of the interpretative possibilities of the whole utterance."[52] Thus, unlike in Black's interaction theory, an interanimation theory of metaphor, as expounded by Richards and Soskice, holds that no single word has a metaphorical meaning, but rather the meaning of a metaphor is found at the level of a complete utterance, as it is dependent upon the interanimation of words. Richard's theory undercuts the Aristotelian notion that individual words have "proper meaning," a notion that lies at the heart of much of Western biblical interpretation.[53] However, one can hold to Richard's philosophy of language without lapsing into a hopeless miasma of the metaphorical realm where there is no possibility of fixed meaning, as long as one recognizes that an utterance (whether literal or metaphorical) picks out a referent.[54]

Expounding upon Richard's foundation, Soskice further argues that a metaphorical utterance leads to "an intercourse of thoughts, as opposed to a mere shifting of words or a substitution of term for term,"[55] and that "these 'thoughts' can be extra-utterance without being extra-linguistic…it is thoughts and not words which

---

[49] Richards, *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 93.
[50] Ideally, a theory should also address the metaphor's reception by the audience; see also Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 44. This question will be addressed in detail in chapter 3.
[51] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 43-51; Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric,* 89-112.
[52] Richards*, The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 55.
[53] See Aristotle, *Cat.*, 1.16a 3.
[54] In the case of figurative language there is often more than one referent possible, but to say that there are several possibilities is not tantamount to a wholly indeterminate meaning. This will be discussed in more detail in section 3.2 below.
[55] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 45.

are active together, although the thoughts are of course bound up with the words."[56] At first blush, the close association Soskice draws between the interanimation of words and the "intercourse of thoughts" seems to impinge upon my earlier insistence that a metaphor is a feature of language. However, under Soskice's definition it is perfectly reasonable to understand a metaphor as a literary phenomenon *that leads to the intercourse of thoughts* where it gives us "two ideas for one." Indeed, Macky notes, "*all use of language has an essential mental component*," and that "mental activity, i.e., meaning and intention, are equally as important for the literal use as they are for figurative."[57] Thus, distinguishing between metaphors and the thoughts they evoke is no different from distinguishing between a non-metaphorical utterance and its mental interpretation by a reader. This distinction between words and thoughts is important to the interpretation of biblical metaphor, and it is particularly helpful in understanding the complex relationship between a metaphorical utterance and its interpretation by a particular audience; this is a feature of metaphor that I will elucidate in greater detail in the following chapter.

2.3.1. Tenor and Vehicle

Rather than speaking of a metaphor having two distinct subjects, as in Black's theory, this study will use Richard's terminology of a metaphor having both a "tenor" and a "vehicle." Dawes defines "tenor" as "the subject upon which it is hoped light will be shed," and the vehicle as "the subject to which allusion is made in order to shed that light."[58] However, unlike Black's theory with its primary and secondary subjects as terms present in the metaphor, the metaphor's tenor need not be explicitly mentioned. Thus, in the following example,

> A stubborn and unconquerable flame
> Creeps in his veins and drinks the streams of life.[59]

the metaphor's tenor is a fever, though the fever is never explicitly named as a term or a subject. Furthermore, this metaphor has several vehicles: the first is a flame, which is further described metaphorically by a second vehicle of a predator that stalks and devours its victim – and further note that both vehicles evoke a different associative

---

[56] Ibid., 45-46.
[57] Macky, *Centrality of Metaphors*, 48-49 (emph. orig.).
[58] Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 27.
[59] Cited in Richards, *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 102.

network of various properties or entities of which the terms might be predicated. The flame might evoke heat, the sensation of being burned, or perhaps an object on fire, whereas that the vehicles "creeps" and "drinks" might evoke a phantasmagorical beast, a fearsome jungle cat, or a vampire. In her example, "a writhing script," where the tenor is the script and the vehicle is "writhing," Soskice notes that, "it may be that at some stage the reader will think of writhing in terms of a thing, or things, that writhe, such as a snake, or a man in pain, or a piece of paper on the fire, or possibly all of these, but none would be either an explicit or necessary second subject of the metaphor."[60] Though the vehicle of a metaphor may contribute a host of various associations, "the content, the full meaning of the metaphor, results from the complete unit of the tenor and vehicle."[61] Thus, Soskice's definition of a metaphor as "speaking about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another," recognizes that although metaphors do not necessarily have two distinct subjects, they do have two elements – tenor and vehicle – that cooperate to create the metaphor's meaning.

2.3.2 Metaphor and Model

I have already stated that a metaphor is, in some senses, to be regarded as a phenomenon of language, but also that metaphors lead to the extra-utterance intercourse of thoughts. The connection between metaphorical utterances and thoughts is upheld through the evocation of a model. Dawes states, "A model is a consistent imaginative construct or (if one prefers) a consistent pattern of thought by means of which apparently isolated phenomena may be seen to be related to one another."[62] Thus, every metaphor has a model, or models, lurking below its surface, models that are present in the thoughts of its hearers/readers. As Black says, "every metaphor is the tip of a submerged model."[63] This close connection between metaphor as a phenomenon proper to language and models as proper to the intercourse of thoughts can be seen in the following example:

> Man is but a reed, the most feeble thing in all of nature, but he is a thinking reed.[64]

---

[60] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 47.
[61] Ibid., 48.
[62] Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 38.
[63] Black, "More About Metaphor," 30.
[64] Blaise Pascal, *The Pensées*, trans. J. M. Cohen (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1961), 100.

The underlying model for Pascal's famous metaphor is evoked by its vehicle "reed," through which the hearer/reader imagines "man" through "a consistent pattern of thought" drawn from his or her images and associations of a "reed" or other "reed-like" things.[65] As Dawes argues, the model associated with the word "reed" "shapes our perception of reality by way of the 'imaginative construct'…which this use of the word creates in our minds."[66] Note also that the word "reed" does not obtain a special metaphorical meaning, but rather a metaphor's model draws on the associations and thought structures created by its conventional word meaning or semantic domain.[67] Moreover, the metaphorical utterance itself constrains which models are associated. For example, although the lexeme "reed" could possibly evoke both a marshland plant and a woodwind instrument as models, the context clearly rules out the latter. Thus in Pascal's example, the model "reed" supplies the image of a marshland plant for the metaphor, and as the audience imagines a man in terms suggestive of a reed, the model might conjure implications like "vulnerability" or "fragility." Thus, in the exegetical process, it is crucial to identify, and in some cases rule out, the underlying model, or models of a metaphor, because only then can the interpreter accurately assess the metaphor's possible implications created by regarding the metaphor's tenor in light of the consistent pattern of thought created by the vehicle and its underlying model(s).

However, it must be emphatically stated that because the meaning of a metaphor occurs at the level of a complete utterance, and that this meaning is ultimately bound by and "interanimated" by its literary context, it would be incorrect to assume that the "meaning" of a metaphor can be determined solely by identifying the appropriate conventional meaning of its model. Not all of the attributes of the model are necessarily transferred into the metaphor. In the example above, it is unlikely that upon hearing the utterance "man is but a reed" one would conclude that men are most like reeds in that they both grow in damp habitats, though "grows in damp habitats" is part of the underlying "reed" model. It is thus quite a different thing to speak of the conventional meaning of "reed" and the metaphorical meaning of the utterance "man is but a reed." The question of metaphorical meaning is complex, and

[65] Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 38.
[66] Ibid.
[67] More is said about this in section 3.1 on metaphor and meaning.

occurs in the hypnotic dance between words and thoughts, in the midst of the somewhat mysterious interaction between its model, tenor, and vehicle.

2.3.3 Meaning and Use

Before proceeding to a praxis-oriented discussion of the interpretation of metaphor in biblical texts, we must consider one further distinction regarding the notion of "meaning." In studies on metaphor, one often reads of a distinction between the "literal" and "metaphorical" meaning of an individual word.[68] This notion of two separate categories of meaning has been sharply questioned by Donald Davidson, who states, "metaphors mean what the words, in their most literal interpretation, mean, and nothing more….[T]he central mistake…is the idea that a metaphor has, in addition to its literal sense or meaning, another sense or meaning."[69] Davidson raises an apt and insightful critique regarding the nature of metaphorical language, as he is correct in asserting that the meaning of a metaphor is dependent on the words in it retaining their "literal" meaning. For example, Black's example, "man is a wolf," indeed becomes unintelligible if "wolf" means something other than "ferocious canine predator." Indeed "wolf" must retain its conventional definition if it is to evoke the appropriate model as an imaginative construct for the audience. However, Davidson's objection, though certainly helpful in clarifying some aspects surrounding the function of metaphor, is sufficiently answered so long as we speak of metaphorical meaning at the level of a complete utterance rather than as an extension of an individual word.[70] As Soskice notes, "The content, the full meaning of the metaphor, results from the complete unit of tenor and vehicle.…The metaphor and its meaning (it is artificial to separate them) are the unique product of the whole and the excellence of a metaphor…[is] that *this* subject, this particular mental state, is accessible only through the metaphor."[71]

Since Davidson does highlight an important distinction between the "meaning" of individual words and the notion of "metaphorical" meaning, in the

---

[68] See also Black's discussion of "focus" and "frame" (*Models and Metaphors*, 27-29).
[69] Davidson, "What Metaphors Mean," 473.
[70] Indeed, as Richards notes, it is somewhat questionable to speak of a word's "meaning" as something that exists apart from the context of an utterance, and Davidson's challenge also suffers on these grounds (*Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 47-66); see also Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 60-64 for an evaluation of Davidson's arguments.
[71] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 48.

interest of clarity this study will use the term "conventional meaning" for a word's established, commonly-used sense as evidenced by non-metaphorical contexts, and I will reserve the term "metaphorical meaning" for the meaning derived from the interanimation between the tenor and vehicle at the level of a complete phrase or utterance.[72] Since metaphorical meaning occurs as a result of the interanimation between words, it is also necessary to determine the conventional meaning of the words in order to ascertain the metaphorical implications.[73] Therefore, the conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία will be treated in a separate chapter as a preliminary exercise to the exegesis and interpretation of its use as a Pauline metaphor.

One further clarification on the "meaning" of a metaphor needs to be offered as a corrective to the rather misguided notion that the question "what is *X* a metaphor for?" can be answered with a "literal" referent. To illustrate this by way of a practical example, it is not uncommon in biblical studies to speak of the Pauline metaphors *for salvation*,[74] such as justification, baptism, redemption, and adoption. However, to speak of a Pauline metaphor *for salvation* means that the interpreter wishes to hear the metaphor's tenor "stripped of its cumbersome vehicle."[75] As Soskice notes, "Tenor and vehicle are inseparable and without the sense of the particular metaphor one may not have the same sense at all."[76] If meaning is determined by the interanimation between tenor and vehicle, then the Pauline metaphors are not reducible to metaphors "for salvation" at all; indeed to see them as such is tantamount to returning to some version of a comparison theory of metaphor, as it assumes that there is a literal paraphrase that underlies every metaphor. Since comparison theories are generally no

---

[72] Macky objects to equating literal use with conventional use because it excludes figurative uses that have become conventional (*Centrality of Metaphors*, 33-34). Macky is right to be wary of excluding figurative conventional senses, but the central issue in that case is not the distinction between literal and conventional, but between living and dead metaphor; see section 2.3.4 below where the progression of metaphors from living to dead is treated in greater detail.

[73] In saying this I affirm Richard's assertion that "we learn how to use words from responding to them and noting how other people use them…I can say equally truly, that a general conformity between users is a condition of communication" (*Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 54). This is not to say that words have a rigid and fixed sense that is somehow innate to them apart from a given context, but rather that they have a basic sense or conventional meaning that is established by their use in discourse.

[74] For example, Burke states "Traditionally, New Testament scholars have understood expressions such as justification (Rom. 5:1), redemption (Gal. 3:13) and propitiation (Rom. 3:25) as *important salvation metaphors*…however, there has been an increasing awareness and appreciation…that *huiothesia* is another soteriological metaphorical expression for the Apostle Paul" (*Adopted into God's Family*, 37-38 [emph. mine]).

[75] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 48.

[76] Ibid.

longer considered valid,[77] the exegetical portion of this study will not speak of υἱοθεσία as a metaphor "for *X*," which would restrict its meaning to a literal paraphrase with a single referent. Rather, for each υἱοθεσία metaphor I will instead posit several options for the metaphor's tenor and explore several avenues of meaning that arise from the interanimation of the tenor and vehicle and manifest themselves in each metaphor's capacity to influence the perception, emotion, and identity of the audience members.[78]

2.3.4 Living and Dead Metaphors

The discussion above has tacitly assumed that all metaphors are, to some degree, recognizable as metaphors. However, most theories of metaphor acknowledge that metaphors begin to lose their "metaphoricity" over time and through repeated use, with the result that most hearers/readers do not perceive them as metaphors at all. Beardsley terms this phenomenon the loss of the "metaphorical twist," or the novel meaning created by a metaphor.[79] As the novelty of the metaphor fades with increased use, the metaphor transitions from a "living" metaphor to a "retired" or "dormant" metaphor, and possibly, as in the case of words such as "muscle" or "comprehend," to a dead metaphor.[80] Dawes aptly states, "what was originally a novel twist of meaning becomes yet another established sense of the word in question."[81] Thus when analyzing and interpreting biblical metaphor one must consider how "alive" the metaphor would have been to its original audience in order to best ascertain its potential impact. Furthermore because, as Dawes observes, "words can lose their metaphoric force,"[82] it is necessary to understand this process and to determine if υἱοθεσία had become a standard or stock metaphor to Paul's audience members.

---

[77] This was discussed briefly in section 2.1 above; for a critique of the inadequacies of comparison theories of metaphor see Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 10-15, 24-26; A. P. Martinich, "A Theory for Metaphor," in *The Philosophy of Language*, 5th ed., ed. A. P. Martinich (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 485-96; Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 3-6.

[78] The relationship between metaphor and perception, emotion, and identity will be examined in more detail in chapter 3.

[79] Beardsley, "The Metaphorical Twist," 301-302.

[80] "Muscle" is derived from the Latin *musculus* meaning "little mouse," and "comprehend" from the Latin *comprehendere* meaning "to grasp." These are examples of words where the etymological history is the only trace of the original metaphor; see also Black, "More About Metaphor," 25; Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 81-83.

[81] Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 73-74.

[82] Ibid., 65.

Determining the aliveness or deadness of a metaphor deals primarily with determining how much effort and reflection a reader/hearer must put forth in order to understand the meaning of a metaphorical utterance. A novel, living metaphor demands reflection in order to be understood, whereas a hearer/reader may not detect a conventional metaphor at all.[83] Presumably, one does not often reflect on an animal's tail when she hears that the taillight has gone out in her car. Nor does one often reflect first on the stem of a flower when speaking about the stem of a wine glass. These uses of language are dead metaphors in that they are "no longer secondary, no longer dependent" upon an underlying model to provide their structure.[84] To use Soskice's definition, dead metaphors no longer "speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another."[85]

Though it has become common to speak of "living" and "dead" metaphors as static categories, upon closer examination these categories appear to be fluid and imprecise, and it may be more appropriate to add several intermediate categories to the discussion. A metaphor's journey from living to dead is much more akin to stages in the growth and development of a tadpole than to the fixed states of inorganic matter; there are identifiable characteristics at each stage of a tadpole's development, but the transitional changes between stages are gradual and somewhat unpredictable. A metaphor's transition from life to death can be thought of as a gradual, and multi-staged process. In regard to a "dead metaphor," or a metaphor whose meaning has become lexicalized, the question might be raised, "should this type of metaphor be termed a 'metaphor' at all?" Metaphor theorists have answered this question in vastly

---

[83] The "metaphor as myth" theory (e.g. the work of Friedrich Nietzsche, Jacques Derrida, Colin Turbayne, and Marc Belth on metaphor) or the contention that metaphors victimize the user whenever a user is unaware she is employing them, is somewhat tangential to our discussion above. Friedrich Nietzsche's striking definition of metaphor as concealed myth is perhaps the best known and most often quoted: "What, then, is truth? A mobile army of metaphors, metonyms, and anthropomorphisms—in short, a sum of human relations, which have been enhanced, transposed, and embellished poetically and rhetorically, and which after long use seem firm, canonical, and obligatory to a people: truths are illusions about which one has forgotten that this is what they are; metaphors which are worn out and without sensuous power; coins which have lost their pictures and now matter only as metal, no longer as coins" ("On Truth and Lie in an Extra-Moral Sense" in *The Portable Nietzsche*, ed. and trans. Walter Kaufmann [New York: Penguin Books, 1982],46-47); see also Jacques Derrida, "The White Mythology: Metaphor in the Text of Philosophy," trans. F. C. T. Moore, *New Literary History* 6 (1974): 5-74; Colin Turbayne, *The Myth of Metaphor* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962); Marc Belth, *The Process of Thinking* (New York: David McKay, 1977); for a detailed evaluation of the theory see Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language,* 74-83; Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 68-72.

[84] Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 65.

[85] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15.

different ways. On one side of the spectrum, there are those who claim that conventional metaphors (e.g. "running water," or "weighing alternatives") continue to refer metaphorically to the original model.[86] Others, like Black, claim that treating a dead metaphor as a metaphor is "no more helpful than, say, treating a corpse as a special case of a person: A so-called dead metaphor is not a metaphor at all, but merely an expression that no longer has a pregnant metaphorical use."[87] However, both extremes are equally unhelpful for understanding how a metaphor is functioning in the biblical text: the first fails to recognize the degree to which conventional metaphors are lexicalized, and the second fails to appreciate that a speaker can still recognize and identify a dead metaphor if attention is drawn to it.[88] Therefore, considering a metaphor's place on the continuum of "living metaphors" and "dead metaphors" is certainly useful for descriptive purposes in exegesis, even if, as Beardsley notes, "the points of transition are not clearly marked."[89]

Beardsley divides the transition of a metaphor into three parts. He describes the first stage of a metaphor as "a word and properties that are definitely not part of the intension of that word."[90] Beardsley's first stage is what Black would term an "active metaphor," or those metaphors with "genuine metaphorical efficacy."[91] An example of an "active metaphor" that we have already seen is Pascal's "Man is but a reed."[92] Since human beings are not typically thought of as "reed-like," Pascal's metaphor necessitates a reader's careful thinking about human beings in terms suggestive of reeds, and the similarities are not immediately apparent. Beardsley's second stage occurs when "what was previously only a property, is made…into a meaning. And widespread familiarity with that metaphor, or similar ones, can fix the property as an established part of the meaning."[93] For example, terminology from sports, like "hitting one out of the park" or a "slam dunk," is frequently applied metaphorically to the realm of business; in fact metaphors in this stage have become

---

[86] Lakoff and Johnson state that in order for metaphors to be truly "dead," the ideas conveyed by dead metaphors "would have to be based on inherent similarities [between the tenor and the vehicle]. But…such similarities are not inherent; they are themselves created via ontological metaphors" (*Metaphors We Live By*, 214).
[87] Black, "More About Metaphor," 25.
[88] See also Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 73.
[89] Beardsley, "The Metaphorical Twist," 303.
[90] Ibid.
[91] Black, "More about Metaphor," 25.
[92] Pascal, *The Pensées*, 100.
[93] Beardsley, "The Metaphorical Twist," 303.

so standard that they sound tired and cliché to most ears. Black would call this stage of the metaphor's life the "dormant" stage or metaphors "where the original, now usually unnoticed, metaphor can be usefully restored."[94] Beardsley's third stage is what most would term a "dead metaphor," or when the original metaphorical property "becomes a necessary condition for applying the word in context…[and] constitutes a new standard sense."[95] Metaphors in this third category are no longer actively perceived by most hearers (e.g. "running" for election, the "foot" of a mountain, the "boot" of a car, a computer "mouse"), and no longer evoke a model and thus do not constitute a dependent use of the word.

2.3.5 The Importance of Tension between Model and Metaphor

It is worth pointing out that some metaphors never pass through all three stages, whereas some metaphors pass through them quite quickly. Metaphors in this latter type are what Soskice terms "metaphors devised to fill lexical gaps."[96] Metaphors that are created to fill gaps have an analogical, and almost imperceptible, connection to the underlying model. As the metaphor passes quickly into standard use, most native speakers do not connect the model with the metaphor any longer. However, the model can usually still be recalled upon reflection. For example, an American English-speaker can probably explain to a British English-speaker why American cars have "trunks" and not "boots" by recalling the roughly analogous "large piece of luggage" and not the "appendage of an elephant," though she most likely would not reflect on the model when speaking with another American. In cases like this one, the underlying model essentially provided a naming function, and consequently even the original metaphor had very little tension between metaphor and model,[97] and so passed quickly into a lexicalized definition.

Identifying this element of tension is particularly pertinent to biblical and theological metaphor, because it is sometimes difficult for a hearer to perceive tension between metaphor and model in theological contexts. Indeed, there are some metaphors that are short-lived because they provide something more akin to an analogical description rather than a novel juxtaposition of images. Soskice notes "a

---

[94] Black, "More about Metaphor," 25; see also Macky, *Centrality of Metaphors*, 115-36.
[95] Beardsley, "The Metaphorical Twist," 303.
[96] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 74.
[97] See chapter 4 for a full discussion of the υἱοθεσία metaphors and their underlying models.

hackneyed or dead metaphor generates no tension because we are accustomed to its juxtaposition of terms, although it may still be a non-standard juxtaposition."[98] The loss of tension between metaphor and model is particularly noticeable in mixed metaphors. Though they would offend stylistic conventions, phrases like "the shark of industry has been thrown to the wolves" or "the meek little lamb foolishly put all of her eggs in one basket" are perfectly understandable in terms of their meaning.

Mixed metaphors are considered a sin against eloquence in writing and rhetoric, but identifying them in the biblical text provides an important window into the metaphor's aliveness for its first audience. In reference to mixed metaphors, George Orwell states, "it can be taken as certain that the writer is not seeing a mental image of the objects he is naming,"[99] and thus mixed metaphors no longer function as sensate expressions that set an image before the eyes of their audience.[100] In exegesis one must be particularly attuned to the tension between metaphor and model, especially since scholars deal so frequently with metaphors that they risk becoming desensitized to the metaphorical utterances in the biblical text. Indeed some biblical metaphors are so familiar that most readers would fail to recognize them as metaphorical utterances. For example, most people would find it much more normal to speak about God the Father as the one who protects Israel from its enemies than it would be to speak of God the Bird, even though the latter is used specifically in reference to God's protection (Isa 31:5).[101] Biblical metaphors, such as God the Father, or Jesus as the Good Shepherd, have become such standard ways of speaking about God that few would bat an eye at the incongruities raised by the Father nursing his children (Hos 11:4), or the shepherd also being a lamb that was slain (Rev 5:6). However, a scholar must be sensitive to the amount of tension between metaphor and model in the biblical text in order to assess the metaphor's potential for impact on its first audience.

2.3.6 Summary: A Working Definition

Though they are chronologically distant from the original setting, I have contended that contemporary definitions and theories of metaphor provide biblical

---

[98] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 73.
[99] George Orwell, *Essays*, ed. John Carey (Everyman's Library, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002), 961; see also Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 73.
[100] Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 1411b.
[101] See also Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 53; Macky, *Centrality of Metaphors*, 75-80.

scholars with a better starting place than ancient definitions and theories for seeking to explain the function and meaning of a metaphor within the biblical text. However, given the notorious problem of definition, it is not surprising that studies often proceed in their application of metaphor theory without clearly defining the term "metaphor."[102] A few brief remarks about definition here will aid in setting clear parameters for the identification and analysis of metaphors in the biblical text. Though there are undoubtedly numerous definitions to draw from,[103] this study will rely on Soskice's broad definition of metaphor as, "that figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another."[104] The benefits of her definition are numerous, but three are particularly relevant to its suitability for exegesis: (1) it is tightly focused on treating metaphor as a phenomenon of language, (2) it attaches metaphorical meaning closely to notions of textuality and, (3) it allows for metaphors to be present in all types of grammatical structure.

Utilizing a definition of metaphor that is closely tied to language use is particularly helpful in a study aimed at furthering the interpretation of the biblical text. This is not to say that metaphors have no impact on cognition or imagination, indeed I will argue later that they exert powerful influence over their readers and hearers. Nevertheless, when dealing with metaphors embedded in a text it is helpful to utilize a definition that allows the interpreter to precisely pinpoint the metaphorical utterance as it stands in the text. Especially in theories of metaphor that emerge from cognitive linguistics, it is not uncommon to read definitions of metaphor that describe metaphors in terms of the mental events or imaginative states of the reader/hearer. Lakoff and Johnson illustrate this well in their assertion, "We have found…that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature."[105] However, the trouble with utilizing a *definition* of metaphor that is closely connected with thoughts or mental events for the

---

[102] For example, though Dawes's study contains two full helpful and erudite chapters on various theories of metaphor, the term "metaphor" itself is never actually defined (*The Body in Question*, 25-78).

[103] See John Searle's 8 principles for identifying and interpreting metaphor ("Metaphor," 104-108); also Richards, "when we use a metaphor we have two thoughts of different things active together and supported by a single word, or phrase, whose meaning is a resultant of their interaction" (*The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 93).

[104] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15.

[105] Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 3.

exegesis of a text is that it becomes difficult to pinpoint the metaphor itself, since it may have been understood or processed differently by several interpreters. As Louise Röska-Hardy remarks,

> Bei dem Versuch, das Geäusserte oder Geschriebene als eine Sprachhandlung zu verstehen, statt als Lärm oder Unsinn zu betrachten, werden Wirkungen in den Gedanken, den Überzeugungen und den Gefühlen des Hörers/Lesers hervorgerufen, welche von seinen weiteren Überzeugungen, seinem Weltwissen und seiner Vorgeschichte als Mitglied der Sprach - und Kulturgemeinschaft abhängen.[106]

Because the act of interpretation involves not only the metaphor as it stands in the text, but also draws upon the beliefs and cultural background of the hearer/reader, in order to isolate the metaphors in the biblical text it is helpful to utilize a definition that puts primacy on metaphor as a linguistic phenomenon. Soskice does this well when she states, "While it may be that the successful employment of metaphor involves non-linguistic observations, perceptions, and responses, it should not be thought that metaphor is primarily a process or mental event, and only secondarily its manifestation in language."[107] Thus, by drawing a distinction between a metaphor as a literary phenomenon on the one hand, and on the other hand its interpretation, which involves the cognitive and imaginative states of a community of readers/hearers, we are in a better place to set identifiable parameters around the metaphor in the literary text and to evaluate its effect on the reading/hearing community.[108]

It is also not atypical for the term "metaphor" to be applied, albeit at times somewhat carelessly, to an object or a state of affairs. If someone, upon gazing at a sunset, declares "the sunset is a metaphor for the end of an era,"[109] then he or she is indeed speaking metaphorically. However, the physical object of "sunset" is not the

---

[106] Louise Röska-Hardy, "Metapher, Bedeutung, und Verstehen," in *Metapher und Innovation: Die Rolle der Metapher im Wandel von Sprache und Wissenschaft*, eds. Henri Lauener, Andreas Graeser, and Gerhard Seel (Bern: Haupt, 1995), 139. However, Röska-Hardy goes too far when she equates the extra-lingual interpretation by the hearer/reader with the phenomenon of metaphor itself; for a critique of Röska-Hardy see Gérard Bornet, "Metapher: (Denk-) Anstoss zum Sprachwandel Bemerkungen zum Beitrag von Louise Röska-Hardy," in *Metapher und Innovation: Die Rolle der Metapher im Wandel von Sprache und Wissenschaft*, eds. Henri Lauener, Andreas Graeser, and Gerhard Seel (Bern: Haupt, 1995), 151-57. Rather than metaphors being extra-linguistic, Bornet argues that metaphors are "einer zweiten Sprache," and to understand a metaphor requires a kind of multilingual (rather than extra-lingual) reasoning (ibid., 152).

[107] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 16.

[108] For a full discussion of the relationship between metaphor and community, see section 3 of chapter 3.

[109] Leaving aside, for the moment, that metaphors are not really metaphors "for" something else, one could easily imagine someone speaking this example.

metaphor in and of itself, but rather it is the speaker's declaration "the sunset is a metaphor" that is metaphorical. Particularly in the exegesis of a text it is important to distinguish between a metaphor as an element embedded in the text and the objects or a states of affairs it draws upon for its meaning (which form the underlying models). This distinction is particularly important for theology, where the objects and states of affairs serve as the underlying model for metaphors that often refer to a transcendent subject. For example, if someone asserted that God's act of "redemption," a state of affairs Paul predicates of believers in Galatians 4:5, was a metaphor, she would be both correct and misleading. "Redemption" as an act or a state of affairs in and of itself is *not* metaphorical, just as a sunset on its own does not constitute a metaphor, but in Galatians 4:4-5 Paul's statement "God sent his Son…in order to redeem" is indeed a metaphor because it occurs within a literary context. Here again, maintaining the distinction between calling the state of affairs "redemption" non-metaphorical, but calling the utterance "God sent his Son…in order to redeem" metaphorical allows us to contemplate the complex relationship between a metaphorical statement and the underlying model (redemption) to which it refers. Thus restricting the term "metaphor" to a literary phenomenon allows for some degree of diversity and disparity between interpretations of the metaphor that inevitably arise from differences in the perception of the underlying model between the metaphor's hearers/readers without losing sight of the metaphor itself.

Moreover, a definition of metaphor that closely ties metaphor to language rather than to an object or state of affairs guards against the tendency to transfer all of an object's properties into a metaphorical utterance. Recalling my first example, if we call the physical object "sunset" a metaphor and apply it to "the end of an era," then is it legitimate to say that the end of an era also leaves its surroundings tinged with purple, pink, and orange light? Of course such a notion seems absurd, but in theology, when objects or states of affairs rather than the utterances in which they are named, are accepted as "metaphorical," it is a much more slippery slope. For example, proponents who argue that δικαιοσύνη in Paul *always* situates righteousness firmly within a forensic context have the propensity to import a detailed courtroom scene into its every occurrence.[110] However, such an action undermines the subtlety of a

[110] David Williams remarks, "It is a legal metaphor that makes a quasi-legal point…The metaphor pictures God as the judge who has reached a decision in favor of the accused, who had been brought

metaphor's ability, as a literary phenomenon, to evoke different associations and implications for different hearers/readers in different literary contexts. In other words, though it is possible for the δικαιοσύνη metaphor to conjure a detailed courtroom scene in some instances (particularly where it occurs in close proximity to other legal terms), it is also possible that other δικαιοσύνη metaphors do not share the same level of resonance. Therefore, because the aim of this study is to exegete the υἱοθεσία metaphors in the Pauline letters, the exegetical chapters will maintain the helpful distinctions between a metaphor as figure of speech embedded in the text, the underlying models (objects and states of affairs) which hover below the surface of each metaphor, and the metaphor's impact on the mental states and imaginative constructs for its audience.

Secondly, by defining metaphor as "that figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another," we treat metaphors as phenomena of language that occur within specific and individual literary contexts. Such a definition is helpful insofar as it causes us to attend to a metaphor's surrounding context within the biblical text, and to guard against the tendency to systematize theological metaphors. Moreover, treating metaphors as a feature of textuality draws attention not only to the metaphor's immediate literary context, but also to the complex intertextual relationships that may be elicited through a metaphorical utterance.[111] In this study, care will be taken to appreciate the differences in the varied literary contexts in which the υἱοθεσία metaphors appear, since Soskice's definition of metaphor roots a metaphor's meaning firmly in the text and context in which it appears. In addition, Soskice's definition also emphasizes the distinction between identifying the presence of a metaphor within a specific literary context (or an oral event), and determining its impact on the perception of the hearers/readers of the text who contemplate it. The distinction is subtle, but for the exegetical process it is beneficial to differentiate between the texts which contain metaphors and the minds that create their interpretation.

---

before God's courts, so to speak, on a charge of unrighteousness" (*Paul's Metaphors: Their Context and Character* [Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999], 145); Michael Bird gives a good overview of the debate surrounding the precise meaning and character of δικαιοσύνη in his book, *The Saving Righteousness of God* (London: Paternoster, 2007, 10-19). Bird's summary demonstrates that the interpretation of the biblical occurrences of δικαιοσύνη are pinned to a particular understanding of the word's conventional meaning, which is not necessarily synonymous with the metaphorical meaning of the utterances in which it occurs.

[111] More will be said about this in the following section on metaphor and exegesis.

Lastly, though Soskice's definition restricts metaphor to a phenomenon of language, it is also broad enough to allow for metaphor to occur in various grammatical and syntactical forms. Often metaphors are analyzed as if they occurred only in the form "*X* is a *Y*," as if the metaphorical focus was always the predicate of some subject. However, it is important to recognize that Paul's declaration "the whole creation has been groaning in labor pains (πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν)" (Rom 8:22) is equally metaphorical. So also is the subjunctive "in order that we might receive adoption as sons (ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν)" (Gal 4:5), as metaphors can occur in any mood. Identifying that metaphors are not limited to a particular grammatical or syntactic form provides a safeguard against the tendency in exegesis to literalize the metaphorical language of a passage.[112] As Soskice notes, "Metaphor displays no one syntactic form because the criteria by which it is distinguished are not merely syntactic, but semantic and pragmatic as well."[113]

3. Metaphor and Exegesis

Because this study is concerned with the interpretation of a biblical metaphor, this section will elucidate several areas of special concern that arise from the intersection of contemporary metaphor theory and biblical exegesis. In recent years there have been several studies devoted specifically to the task of interpreting biblical metaphors in light of contemporary metaphor theory,[114] and this study will both utilize and build upon their insights and advancements in biblical interpretation. Because the second half of this study is concerned with the interpretation of a specific set of Pauline metaphors (utterances which use υἱοθεσία), and previous studies written

[112] There is a troubling trend among some theologians to force biblical metaphors into literal categories, as some do not recognize biblical metaphors as metaphorical at all. Tim Trumper makes the rather puzzling comment regarding the biblical language of adoption and new birth, "Supposing these two elements are non-metaphorical realities, then there is a divine logic that surpasses a human understanding of birth and adoption" ("An Historical Study of the Doctrine of Adoption in the Calvinistic Tradition," University of Edinburgh: Ph. D. Diss., 2001), 83. Similarly, Ivor Davidson remarks "*Huiothesia* is no mere metaphor; it specifies a genuine transformation that has occurred and will occur for them in virtue of who he is and what he has done" ("Salvation's Destiny: Heirs of God," in *God of Salvation: Soteriology in Theological Perspective*, ed. Ivor J. Davidson and Murray A. Rae [Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2011], 164).

[113] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 19.

[114] E.g. Aasgaard, *"My Beloved Brothers and Sisters"*; Dawes, *The Body in Question*; Nijay Gupta, "Towards a Set of Principles for Identifying and Interpreting Metaphors in Paul: ΠΡΟΣΑΓΩΓΗ (Romans 5:2) as a Test Case," *ResQ* 51.3 (2009): 169-81; Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, Macky, *Centrality of Metaphors*; Sallie McFague, *Metaphorical Theology: Models of God in Religious Language* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982).

on the interpretation of this metaphor have largely sought to pinpoint a specific meaning (often via the identification of its correct background), the primary aim of the following section is to challenge several of the presuppositions related to the interpretation of metaphor that lead to some erroneous conclusions in exegesis. Therefore, the following section will focus specifically on the relationship between metaphor, context, and intertextuality, the indeterminacy of metaphorical meaning, and the relationship between metaphor and epistemology.

3.1 Text, Context, Intertextuality, and Metaphorical Meaning

The relationship of metaphor and literary context is of particular significance for the interpretation of biblical metaphors. This is an especially needed corrective for the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors, as previous studies have been too heavily focused on establishing their correct background and tended to pay little attention to how Paul is using the metaphors within the text itself.[115] Moreover, although several studies have identified potential intertextual connections between Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphors and other texts, no study has seriously examined how these texts, and the metaphors embedded in them, interact with one another, or analyzed Paul's role as an interpreter of the sonship motif. There has also been a tendency in previous studies on the υἱοθεσία metaphors to import the meaning from one metaphorical context to another without giving adequate thought to how metaphorical meaning is produced. Therefore, several observations regarding metaphor, text, context, and intertextuality must be made prior to the exegetical process if we are to properly integrate metaphor theory and biblical interpretation: (1) determining the "appropriate background" (either through "background" texts or historical background) and conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία does not automatically yield the meaning of the Pauline metaphors where υἱοθεσία occurs, (2) the intertextual relationships between the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors and other texts are dynamic and complex, and (3) we cannot speak of the Pauline meaning of the "υἱοθεσία metaphor" in total, but rather we must speak of the various meanings and implications that arise from the individual occurrences of the metaphor, as metaphorical meaning is not necessarily transferred between literary contexts.

---

[115] E.g. Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons*; Scott, *Adoption as Sons*; this issue is discussed in more detail in section 1 of chapter 1.

3.1.1 Metaphor and "Background"

The bulk of the research that has been published on the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors has been focused on determining the appropriate conventional meaning and background of υἱοθεσία. In older studies it was largely taken for granted that the Roman practices of adoption were the appropriate background of υἱοθεσία.[116] This tenet was challenged by Byrne, who argued that υἱοθεσία should be understood as meaning "sonship" rather than "adoption,"[117] and is best interpreted as a continuation of the "sonship" motif found in Jewish literature. Although Scott's extensive analysis of the adoption word-group (υἱοθεσία, εἰσποιεῖν, ἐκποιεῖν, ποιεῖσθαι, υἱοποιεῖσθαι, τίθεσθαι, υἱοθετεῖν) determined that the most appropriate translation of υἱοθεσία is "adoption to sonship," and that the conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία derived from its use in Roman and Greek adoption practices, [118] he too sees Jewish texts (esp. 2 Sam 7:14) and a Jewish adoption formula as the appropriate background for its use in the Pauline corpus. Notably, these previous studies, which are largely focused on identifying the background, to varying degrees operate under the assumption that "the issue can be decided by surveying the existing senses of the word."[119]

However, I have argued in the first part of this chapter that metaphorical meaning occurs at the level of a complete utterance, which means that a metaphor's meaning is not determined by "adding up" the conventional meanings of the words it employs. Dawes notes that studies that seek to determine the metaphorical meaning of an utterance by establishing the correct conventional meaning of a controversial word "fall into some serious errors."[120] He goes on to say that "confusion … arises first of all from a failure to distinguish two operations. The first is the translation of a word. The second is the spelling out of the sense of its metaphorical use."[121] Therefore, while background studies are helpful insofar as they delineate the conventional meaning, it does not necessarily follow that all of the properties of the conventional meaning of the vehicle will be transferred to the primary subject (tenor) of the metaphor.

---

[116] See also Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons*, 67-99, for a sustained defense of this view.
[117] Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 183.
[118] Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, xiv.
[119] Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 125-26 (n.b. Dawes himself does not subscribe to such a view).
[120] Ibid., 126.
[121] Ibid.

3.1.2 Metaphor and Context

To illustrate that the meaning of a metaphor occurs at the level of a full utterance and is therefore contextually bound, let us look at several examples of biblical metaphors that utilize the same lexeme as their vehicle. Athletic metaphors, especially metaphors evocative of running and footraces, occur in many places in the Pauline corpus, many of which employ various forms of the lexeme τρέχω. The conventional meaning of τρέχω is defined as "to make rapid linear movement, *run, rush, advance*," "to exert oneself," or "to proceed quickly without restraint."[122] Τρέχω is the vehicle of the metaphors present in Galatians 5:7, 1 Corinthians 9:24-26, and 2 Thessalonians 3:1, but each of these metaphors has slightly different meaning. Furthermore, these examples show that the same vehicle can be used to create strong and weak metaphors, depending on its combination with the metaphor's tenor and frame. In 1 Corinthians 9:24-26 τρέχω is used as part of an extended metaphor, which states:

> Οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ ἐν σταδίῳ *τρέχοντες* πάντες μὲν *τρέχουσιν*, εἷς δὲ λαμβάνει τὸ βραβεῖον; οὕτως *τρέχετε* ἵνα καταλάβητε. πᾶς δὲ ὁ ἀγωνιζόμενος πάντα ἐγκρατεύεται, ἐκεῖνοι μὲν οὖν ἵνα φθαρτὸν στέφανον λάβωσιν, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἄφθαρτον. ἐγὼ τοίνυν οὕτως *τρέχω* ὡς οὐκ ἀδήλως, οὕτως πυκτεύω ὡς οὐκ ἀέρα δέρως· ἀλλ' ὑπωπιάζω μου τὸ σῶμα καὶ δουλαγωγῶ, μή πως ἄλλοις κηρύξας αὐτὸς ἀδόκιμος γένωμαι.[123]

In this context the metaphor is well developed, and it is clear from the context that it is specifically running in a competition that is in view as the metaphor's vehicle as evidenced by the inclusion of ἐν σταδίῳ and the reference to both footraces and boxing (πυκτεύω). The tenor of 1 Cor 9:24-26 is not explicitly mentioned, but the most likely candidate is the idea of "moral self-control" given the wider context of the letter (e.g. 1 Cor 8:1-13).[124] However, it is not accurate to say that this passage is a metaphor *for* self-control, as τρέχω might also evoke associations regarding obtaining eternal life, or maintaining faithfulness to the gospel message. The context of 1 Corinthians 9:24-26 creates a strong metaphor and allows for multivalent readings

---

[122] BDAG, 1015 (emph. orig.).

[123] "Do you not know that in a race the runners all compete (run), but only one receives the prize? Run in such a way that you may win it. Athletes exercise self-control in all things; they do it to receive a perishable wreath, but we an imperishable one. So I do not run aimlessly, nor do I box as though beating the air, but I punish my body and enslave it, so that after proclaiming to others I myself should not be disqualified."

[124] See Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NIGTC, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 708-717 for a detailed exegetical analysis of 1 Cor 9:24-26 with "self-control" as a framework for interpretation.

and several metaphorical "meanings" that occur at the level of the full metaphorical utterance – meanings that are not necessarily present in other metaphorical utterances where τρέχω appears as the vehicle.

Galatians 5:7 also contains a metaphorical use of τρέχω, and there the metaphor is not quite as strong as the example from 1 Corinthians 9:24-26. Here Paul exclaims Ἐτρέχετε καλῶς· τίς ὑμᾶς ἐνέκοψεν [τῇ] ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι;[125] in reference to the issue of circumcision and law-keeping, which in this example is the tenor of the metaphor. Most commentators agree that τρέχω brings to mind images of an athletic footrace,[126] though the absence of other accompanying images from athletic contests leaves open the possibility for the audience to associate other potential models. Furthermore, the shift in frame between 1 Corinthians 9 and Galatians 5 produces a different set of implications or meanings for the metaphor in which τρέχω is used. Where τρέχω in 1 Corinthians highlights the connection between athletics and self-discipline, in Galatians τρέχω stresses the link between athletics and "fair play," or the continual adherence to correct doctrine.

Taking 2 Thessalonians 3:1 as a third example, which reads προσεύχεσθε, ἀδελφοί, περὶ ἡμῶν, ἵνα ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου τρέχῃ καὶ δοξάζηται,[127] we see an even weaker metaphor using τρέχω as its vehicle. Here the vehicle "running" combined with the tenor "the word of the Lord" possibly conjures associations of a particularly swift and adept runner in an athletic contest.[128] However, given that this particular frame lacks the specifics of 1 Corinthians, it is also possible that τρέχω here associates other things that move swiftly as well. Indeed Malherbe affirms both that τρέχω "has overtones of Ps 147:4 LXX" and that "it was also an athletic metaphor popular in Paul's day."[129] It is also quite possible that this was neither intended nor received as a particularly strong metaphor, and that Paul's audience did not actively contemplate ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου in terms seen to be suggestive of running a footrace

[125] "You were running well. Who prevented you from obeying the truth?"
[126] E.g. Betz, *Galatians*, 264-65; see also J. Louis Martyn, who translates Gal. 5:7 "for some time you ran a good footrace," (*Galatians* [AB, New York: Doubleday, 1997], 474).
[127] "Pray for us, brothers and sisters, that the word of the Lord may run (spread rapidly) and be glorified."
[128] These are by no means the only mental associations possible, but they are the implications that I contemplated first upon reading the metaphor. That other readers contemplate other different, but related, mental associations gives further credence to the indeterminate nature of metaphor.
[129] Abraham J. Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians* (AB, New York: Doubleday, 2000), 444.

(τρέχω), but rather "spread rapidly" had become, for most, a conventional meaning of the word.[130]

There are, most certainly, some overlapping implications between these three contexts, but there are also three distinctly different sets of "meanings" produced by the three metaphorical uses of τρέχω. What these examples demonstrate is that not only are there multiple meanings possible within a given context, but that these meanings do not necessarily transfer between contexts even when the same word is being used as the vehicle of the metaphor. Therefore it is problematic to speak of τρέχω having "metaphorical meaning" as an individual lexeme,[131] and an exegete must be prepared to embrace a multivalence of meanings for lexemes that occur in several separate metaphorical contexts within the biblical text. This issue seems rather benign when speaking of athletic imagery, but the connection between metaphorical meaning and context is a potential stumbling block for interpreting υἱοθεσία, whose theological "meaning" has been explained historically by synthesizing all of its NT occurrences into a single definition. Applying contemporary metaphor theory to the υἱοθεσία metaphor, and thereby binding metaphorical meaning tightly to a specific context, admonishes the exegete to "hear the voices" from each occurrence of the metaphor, and hold their meanings in tension if necessary.

3.1.3 Metaphor and Intertextuality

Because several of the monographs on the background of the Pauline occurrences of υἱοθεσία have focused on identifying its background from Old Testament and intertestamental texts, it is necessary here to include a few brief remarks about the intersection between metaphor theory, model and intertextuality. Manfred Pfister remarks, "Die Theorie der Intertextualität ist die Theorie der Beziehungen zwischen Texten. Dies ist unumstritten; umstritten jedoch ist, welche Arten von Beziehungen darunter subsumiert werden sollen."[132] Pfister's observation is especially poignant for biblical studies, where the term "intertextuality" is often

---

[130] For more on a metaphor's progression from "living" to "dead," see section 2.3.4 above.
[131] John Searle remarks that this type of thinking common to semantic interaction and comparison theories results from "the failure to appreciate the distinction between sentence or word meaning, which is never metaphorical, and speaker or utterance meaning, which can be metaphorical" ("Metaphor," 90).
[132] Manfred Pfister, "Konzepte der Intertextualität," in *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, eds. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1985), 11.

bandied about,[133] but there is little agreement on a precise theory of intertextuality and frequently a certain lack of precision as to its meaning. Furthermore, many biblical scholars utilize "intertextual" methodologies which are often quite foreign to Julia Kristeva's original theory of intertextuality.[134] Moreover, the term "intertextuality" is unfortunately little more than "a modern literary theoretical coat of veneer over the old comparative approach."[135] However, for her part, Kristeva envisaged intertextuality as the study of a text "within [the text of] society and history."[136] Quite distinct from studies that treat intertextuality as little more than an exercise in "source hunting,"[137] Kristeva's definition of "text" is much wider and includes also the notion of culture as "the general text" which acts as another dialogue partner with precursors and successors, making it a particularly adaptable and useful theory for examining the intertextual relationships between the metaphors embedded in the biblical texts.[138]

Kristeva's method was primarily interested in the transposition of textual patterns "from one signifying system to another."[139] In her view, this transposition was essentially an ideological exercise by the author.[140] Moreover, according to Kristeva's theory, texts are not merely a reflection of history and culture, but rather

---

[133] Christopher Hays is probably correct in observing that intertextuality is best thought of as a category of methodologies rather than a specific methodology ("Echoes of the Ancient Near East?: Intertextuality and the Comparative Study of the Old Testament," in *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays*, eds. J. Ross Wagner, C. Kavin Rowe, and A. Katherine Grieb [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008], 26).

[134] For a good overview and critique of the development of intertextuality see Pfister, "Konzepte der Intertextualität," 1-30; Holthuis, *Intertextualität*, 12-28.

[135] Ellen van Wolde, "Trendy Intertextuality?" in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel*, ed. Sipke Drasma (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1989), 43; for a defense of the legitimacy of "intertextuality" as a distinct mode of inquiry see Bern Schulte-Middelich, "Funktionen intertextueller Textkonstitution," in *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, eds. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1985), 197-242.

[136] Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. Leon S. Roudiez, trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), 37.

[137] Kristeva writes that intertextuality is not concerned with "le sense banal de 'critique des sources'" (*La revolution du langage poétique* [Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1974], 31).

[138] Ibid., 94-100.

[139] Ibid., 60.

[140] Ulrich Broich argues a similar concept, observing that intertextuality is present when an author conscientiously employs a precursor text and also expects his or her readers to recognize the intended use of the text in its new context. Broich states, "Es leigt daher nahe, dass Verfasser solcher Texte deren intertextuelle Bezüge auf irgendeine Weise markieren, damit der Leser diese Bezüge sieht und sie auch als intendiert erkennt" ("Formen der Markierung von Intertextualität," in *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, eds. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister [Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1985], 31).

texts affect history and culture, and "insert themselves into it."[141] Though some have sought to portray Kristeva's method as ahistorical,[142] one of her stated goals was to situate a text in history, and moreover her methodology emphasizes the author as the agent who is responsible for the transposition of texts. This is not to say that the author has absolute control over the meaning that his or her texts create, but rather to recognize that without the author there would be no text. However, although some have alleged that Kristeva's understanding of a text is too broad to be useful for intertextual inquiry in literature,[143] Kristeva's understanding of intertextuality need not lead to an entirely indeterminate or nebulous inquiry of intertextual relationships,[144] even if the authorial intention is to some degree unrecoverable. Rather, Kristeva's insistence of an author's intentionality in transposing texts can be combined with the notion that texts themselves to some degree constrain the intertextual relationships that they elicit. For example, Holthius argues "Der Text selbst hat somit einen massgeblichen Einfluss auf die Bedeutungskonstitution, Rezeptionserwartungen, die sich etwa aus seinen angenommenen texttypologieschen Eigenschaften ergeben, führen zu Vorentscheidungen, die den Verarbeitungsprozess steuern."[145] Kristeva's emphasis on the author as an active agent in transposing textual patterns, and Holthuis's insistence that texts themselves impose restraints on the production of meaning, aids in the exegesis of Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphors in particular because, from the outset, these parameters present Paul as a careful and intentional interpreter, rather than a mere appropriator of precursory texts.

---

[141] Julia Kristeva, "Narration et Transformation," *Semiotica* 1 (1969): 443; see also Hays, "Echoes of the Ancient Near East?," 29-31.

[142] E.g. Robert L. Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1995), 4; Jacob Neusner, *Canon and Connection: Intertextuality in Judaism* (Studies in Judaism, Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1987), xiii. For a different perspective, see Michael Riffaterre, who claims that rather than intertextuality giving rise to a plurality of possible readings, the intertext "provides the clue to interpretation by canceling the undecidable reading" ("Interpretation and Undecidability" *New Literary History* 12.2 (1981): 233.

[143] See esp. Tegtmeyer, "Der Begriff der Intertextualität," 51-56; Holthuis, *Intertextualität*, 12-19.

[144] This is the German school's critique of Kristeva; e.g. Broich claims, "Wenn man den Begriff der Intertextualität in einem so weiten Sinn verwendet, dass jeder Text in all seinen Elementen intertextuell ist, verliert der Begriff seine Trennschärfe und damit seine wissenschaftliche Brauchbarkeit zumindest für die Analyse einzelner Texte" ("Bezugsfelder der Intertextualität: Zur Einzeltextreferenz," in *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, eds. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1985), 48; see also Holthuis, *Intertextualität*, 12-19; Tegtmeyer, "Der Begriff der Intertextualität," 51-56.

[145] Holthuis, *Intertextualität*, 180.

Though they do not state it outright, both Scott and Byrne approach the question of Paul's background with the somewhat reductionist assumption that intertextuality is restricted to the diachronic dimension of a text, and that it is confined to the identification of the literary sources and influences that lie behind a given text. In seeking to pinpoint the precise influences and traditions that have informed the Pauline use of υἱοθεσία, both Scott and Byrne share much in common with studies that treat intertextuality as, in W. W. Hallo's words, "a text's dependence on and infiltration by prior codes, concepts, conventions, unconscious practices and texts…as such it replaces or complements synchronic by diachronic considerations."[146] However, Hallo's limited definition, key elements of which are seen in both Byrne's and Scott's methodology, does not adequately capture the complexities most practitioners of intertextual methods identify as inherent in using an intertextual approach. Rather, most scholars with a robust understanding of the dynamics of intertextuality, such as Steve Moyise, argue that a text "cannot be understood in isolation. It can only be understood as part of a web or matrix of other texts, themselves only to be understood in the light of other texts. Each new text disturbs the fabric of existing texts as it jostles for a place."[147]

Coupled with Moyise's argument that texts cannot be understood in isolation from one another, Kristeva's theory, with its wide definition of a text and its emphasis on the complexities that arise from the transposition of textual patterns, helps to illuminate the mosaic of relationships between texts and the metaphors embedded within them.[148] Moreover, if Soskice's theory of metaphor focuses on the interanimation of words, then in using Kristeva's theory, perhaps by extension we can

---

[146] W. W. Hallo, "Proverbs Quoted in Epic," in *Lingering over Words: Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Literature in Honor of William L. Moran*, ed. Tzvi Abusch, John Huehnergard, Piotr Steinkeller (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 203; see also Radu Gheorghita, *The Role of the Septuagint in Hebrews: An Investigation of Its Influence with Special Consideration to the Use of Hab 2:3-4 in Heb 10:37-38* (WUNT II 160, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003). Gheorghita distinguishes between traditional intertextuality which is a "static and diachronic concept, which depicts various ways in which authors make use of previously written texts," and postmodern intertextuality which argues that a "precursor text can never be just a simple presence in the successor text" (ibid., 73, n. 6).

[147] Steve Moyise, "Intertextuality and Historical Approaches to the Use of Scripture in the New Testament," in *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, eds. Richard B. Hays, Stefan Alkier, Leroy A. Huizenga (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009), 23.

[148] *Pace* Broich's assertion that the "hard core (harten Kern)" of intertextuality lies "in denen sich ein Text auf einen bestimmten, individuellen Prätext bezieht, wobei dann auch der Begriff des Textes in einem engen Sinn zu verwenden wäre" ("Bezugsfelder der Intertextualität," 48). Under Broich's narrow definition of "text" the Pauline υἱοθεσία texts seemingly would not fit the criteria for intertextual inquiry at all; for a critique of Broich's thesis and a defense of typological intertextual relationships see Holthuis, *Intertextualität*, 51-88.

approach metaphor and intertextuality as an examination of the interanimation of texts in the intertextual space. In order to provide a concrete example for my conception of "intertextual space," I offer the following analogy. Off the northwesternmost point of New Zealand, at Cape Reinga, the waters from the Tasman Sea and the Pacific Ocean collide into one another creating a swirling current of unsettled waters just off the coast. As the waters meet, the waves jostle for place, some swirling into large whirlpools, and some relentlessly marching headlong into the waves from the opposing current. Rather than being static entities, texts interanimated in the intertextual space react to one another in much the same way. Some precursor texts might relentlessly march forward into the successor texts, dominating the landscape of their new setting. Other precursor texts might intermingle more gently with successor texts, creating a new set of serene ripples. Still others might interact in a tumultuous current, creating a whirlpool of meaning which transforms both precursor and successor texts. This process of interanimation looks different each time it plays out in the intertextual space, and thus one must attend carefully not only to what precursor texts are present in successors, but also to how these texts interact with one another to produce new figuration.

Speaking about intertextuality as the "interanimation of texts" also brings clarity to a particular issue involved with the exegesis of Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphors, which is that the υἱοθεσία metaphors do not have any precise literary parallels with any texts in the Old Testament or intertestamental sources.[149] Though previous studies have treated the intertextual relationships between the Pauline υἱοθεσία texts and precursors in a manner that smoothed out the differences between υἱοθεσία and other metaphors in the precursor texts, I would suggest that what is needed is an understanding of intertextuality that seeks meaning in the intersection of the competing metaphors (e.g. "adoption," "sons," and "firstborn") that are "jostling for a place."

A brief example of how a metaphor might function in the interanimation of texts will bring some clarity to the complexities involved in interpreting the intertextual relationships evoked through metaphors. In John 6 Jesus uses the metaphor "I am the bread of life (ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς)" in 6:35, which in the wider context of John 6 is an explicit reinterpretation of YHWH's provision of manna

[149] This will be discussed in detail in chapter 4 and in section 3 of chapter 7.

in the exodus event (Exod 16:1-36; Psalm 78:24).[150] Although John 6 does contain several direct quotations and allusions to Exodus 16 (e.g. John 6:31, 41, 49, 58), it is obviously insufficient to conclude that the meaning of the metaphor ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς can be constructed out of the precursor text in Exodus 16. Rather, the meaning of Jesus' metaphor occurs in the collision of texts where YHWH is the provider of manna for the Israelites and John's new metaphor describing Jesus' personal identity (ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς) in the intertextual space. The meaning of the metaphorical utterance lies in the interanimation between the precursor texts and John's new metaphor; it lies in the appropriation and reinterpretation of these images as a marker of his identity as the Son of Man (John 6:53). So too, the intertextual connections evoked by the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors are interanimated in the intertextual space where text speaks to text to create rich and multivalent layers of metaphorical meaning.

Whereas monographs that focus on identifying the "background" from precursor texts view intertextuality as a primarily diachronic relationship, viewing intertextuality as an interanimation of texts seeks to understand how Paul's appropriation of the precursor texts might be working synchronically with his υἱοθεσία metaphors to create meaning for his audience. Brawley describes intertextuality as,

> A fusion of horizons…when one text takes on the task of interpreting by appealing to a precursor, each text sings in its own voices even as its voices also sing in unison, in harmony, or in discord with voices of the other. Whereas the conventional approach focuses on a *diachronic* relationship between the precursor and the successor, from the perspective of intertextuality the new text and the precursor hang on each other holistically in a *synchronic* relationship.[151]

Rather than isolating a single underlying model for the "background" of the metaphors drawn from diachronic relationships with precursor texts, the interanimation theory of metaphor and intertextuality this study utilizes leaves room for various intertextual relationships that contain layers of possible images, and for those texts and models to reinterpret one another. Therefore, in the exegesis of the

---

[150] Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John* (SP, Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1989); Leon Morris, *The Gospel of John* (NICNT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 320; *pace* Herman Ridderbos, who argues that the Bread of Life Discourse is a general reference to the assuaging of hunger and thirst (*The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary*, trans. John Vriend [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997], 229).

[151] Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech*, 6 (emphasis mine).

υἱοθεσία metaphors I will treat potential intertextual relationships as dynamic and synchronic, finding the meaning in the subtleties and "whispered or unstated correspondences"[152] interanimated in the intertextual space.

3.2 Meaning is Indeterminate

Until recently, the task of biblical exegesis was to arrive at the "correct" interpretation of the text based on its grammatical analysis, cultural background, setting, location, and a host of other quantifiable factors.[153] In keeping with this trend, the goal of many interpreters of biblical metaphor is to explain the metaphor's meaning using a literal paraphrase, which I have already shown to be problematic.[154] Indeed Ricoeur argues, "real metaphors are not translatable…This is not to say that they cannot be paraphrased, just that such a paraphrase is infinite and incapable of exhausting the innovative meaning."[155] If Ricoeur is correct, then the notion of a single "correct" interpretation is also problematic, as the nature of a metaphor is to yield some degree of indeterminacy in its meaning. Martinich notes that this indeterminateness "is not a defect," but rather it "is one of the more intriguing features of metaphors; it is what encourages the audience to play with and explore the concepts involved – to look for relationships between things not previously countenanced."[156] However, this is not to say that all readings of a metaphor are "good readings" or that all readings are equally valid, but rather to point out that a metaphor might have a range of valid meanings or interpretations rather than a single, univocal paraphrase.

In taking our example above, Pascal's "Man is but a reed," a whole range of possible meanings is immediately apparent (e.g. man is thin, frail, hollow, fragile, tender, or "someone who is blown around by the wind"),[157] and no single meaning from this range can be held up as the "correct" meaning to the exclusion of the others.

---

[152] Richard Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 20.
[153] Richard Coggins has a rather insightful and enjoyable analysis of this phenomenon in his paper, "A Future for the Commentary?" in *The Open Text: New Directions for Biblical Studies*, ed. Francis Watson (London: SCM Press, 1993), 163-75.
[154] See section 2.1 above.
[155] Paul Ricoeur, *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning* (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1976), 52.
[156] Martinich, "A Theory for Metaphor," 490.
[157] I am grateful for my colleagues at the University of Otago for their contributions to this list of meanings.

Neither is the "meaning" of this metaphor a completely stable entity that can be determined by correctly identifying what Pascal as the author "meant" when he wrote, "Man is but a reed." Supposing that a metaphor's meaning can be determined by an appeal to authorial intent presumes that the author also "meant" some literal paraphrase that underlies the metaphor, rather than accepting that what the author "meant" to write was the metaphor as it stands in a given text. If, therefore, we presume that an author intentionally employs a metaphor, we must also accept that he or she invites some degree of indeterminacy in the meaning of the text based on its reception by the reader. As Davidson remarks, "Metaphor is the dreamwork of language and, like all dreamwork, its interpretation reflects as much on the interpreter as on the originator."[158] Furthermore, the interpretations of a metaphor can shift and change slightly each time an individual reader returns to the text, and they certainly vary to some degree between readers. Perhaps then it is appropriate to conceive of a metaphor having a cluster of meanings, or of its meaning having somewhat "ragged edges" around a more stable center.[159]

For biblical exegesis then, the indeterminacy of metaphor has the potential to be an exciting feature of the text, opening up new avenues of meaning that may have been previously excluded from consideration, but if it is carried too far it becomes a black hole, sucking the interpreter into an infinite gloom where meaning remains an entirely elusive concept. Vanhoozer remarks, "Metaphors are equivocal; they do not have one clear sense, so that they cannot give rise to clear and distinct knowledge …. [I]n metaphor, meanings refuse to stand still."[160] Fortunately, as Vanhoozer observes, "we need not choose between a meaning that is wholly determinate and a meaning that is wholly indeterminate."[161] Again taking Pascal's example, we notice that though there is a range of possible meanings, each of these meanings relies on a connection between the metaphor and its underlying model – that is, each meaning is derived from the intersection of thinking of a man in terms seen to be suggestive of a reed. Furthermore, features of a reed that are inappropriate for transfer to a human being, such as "grows in damp places," or "utilizes photosynthesis," are not

---

[158] Davidson, "What Metaphors Mean," 473.
[159] Vanhoozer makes a similar claim, calling for what he terms "adequate interpretation" (*Is There a Meaning in This Text?*, 139-40).
[160] Ibid., 127.
[161] Ibid., 139.

countenanced. So while Ricoeur is correct in saying that metaphor is in some ways non-translatable, it does not follow that it is unintelligible to the hearer/reader. Since meanings are derived from thinking of "one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another" (or in thinking of the tenor in terms appropriate to the vehicle), we need only consider meanings that are derived from the properties possessed by the metaphor's underlying model. Thus, while all metaphors, including biblical metaphors, are to some degree indeterminate, they still have a limited range of possible meanings that are available for consideration based on identifying and associating the model(s) which underlie the metaphor.

In addition to the indeterminacy of a metaphor being limited by its underlying model, the literary context also often provides limitations for the possibilities of meaning. Pascal's metaphor, "Man is but a reed," occurs in a larger discussion about the connection between thought and humanness. Indeed, just before his famous metaphor, Pascal concludes that "thought is the greatness of man" and just after he notes that "the entire universe need not arm itself to crush him."[162] Therefore, while there is still a range of possible associations, the immediate context of the metaphor under examination causes the reader to pick out the associations connected with fragility. However, the precise associations conjured by thinking of man in terms seen to be suggestive of the fragile reed model are still impossible to fix determinately from reader to reader. In light of these conclusions, this study aims to embrace the indeterminacy of metaphor by speaking of a range of possible implications drawn from considering the possible models underlying the vehicle "υἱοθεσία," and the interanimation of the tenor and vehicle considered against the context (the frame) of the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans and Galatians, while also recognizing that the implications given may or may not be present for all readers at all times.

3.3 Metaphor and Epistemology

3.3.1 Literal and Metaphorical Truth

There is a strong trend in the Western philosophy born of the Enlightenment that puts a high premium on "literal" truth and asserts, as Locke puts it, that metaphors "in all discourses that pretend to inform or instruct, [are] wholly to be

[162] Pascal, *The Pensées*, 100.

avoided and, where truth and knowledge are concerned, cannot but be thought a great fault either of the language or person that makes use of them."[163] Thus, what philosophers have deemed "metaphorical truth" is truth or knowledge of a lower class and inferior nature. This distinction implies that "metaphorical truths" are really, at their root, literal truths mediated and communicated—and somehow obscured—through metaphor. However, the dichotomy of "literal" and "metaphorical" truth is a false one, and Wilhelm Köller argues that the real issue lies not only with metaphor, but with "das Problem des Verhältnisses der Sprache zur aussersprachlichen Wirklichkeit."[164] As Black observes, "an emphatic, indispensable metaphor does not belong to the realm of fiction, and is not merely being used, as some writers allege, for some mysterious aesthetic effect, but really does say something."[165] Indeed, cognitive theorists have argued convincingly that metaphors are creative rather than merely descriptive – that is, they are capable of shaping how a person conceives of reality;[166] a truly creative metaphor communicates truths which have no literal paraphrase.

However, it is worth bearing in mind that although "[a] person who speaks metaphorically aims at the truth,"[167] it does not follow that all of the properties of the metaphor's underlying model necessarily refer. For example, in taking the metaphor "it's a zoo out there," to describe a busy day at the shopping mall, a person at once grasps the chaotic scene without simultaneously being concerned that she will literally be trampled to death by elephants. Nevertheless, in equating a shopping mall with a zoo, this metaphor creates much stronger associations than does the literal sentence "the mall is extremely busy." It is also certainly not accurate to conclude that the person who utters "it's a zoo out there" is speaking falsely simply because all aspects of the underlying zoo model fail to refer. Both "it's a zoo out there" and "the

---

[163] Locke, *Essay*, bk. III, chap. 10; see also Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, pt. 1. chap. 4 "On Speech"; Bertrand Russell, *Logic and Knowledge: Essays 1901-1950*, ed. Charles Marsh (London: Allen & Unwin, 1956), 178-89; Ludwig Wittgenstein, *The Wittgenstein Reader*, ed. Anthony Kenny (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), 70-83; for an overview of metaphor in the philosophy of the Enlightenment see Oliver R. Scholz, "Wit und Regeln: Metaphern und ihre Auslegung in der Philosophie der Aufklärung," in *Metapher und Innovation: Die Rolle der Metapher im Wandel von Sprach und Wissenschaft*, eds. Henri Lauener, Andreas Graeser, and Gerhard Seel (Bern: Haupt, 1995), 39-52.
[164] Wilhelm Köller, *Semiotik und Metapher: Untersuchungen zur grammatischen Struktur und kommunikativen Funktion von Metapher* (Studien zur allgemeinen und vergleichenden Literaturwissenschaft 10, Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche, 1975), 28.
[165] Black, "More About Metaphors," 39.
[166] E.g. Black, "More About Metaphors," 38; Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 3-10.
[167] Martinich, "A Theory for Metaphor," 486.

mall is extremely busy" aim at communicating truth, but the truth communicated through the metaphor is creative and requires some level of interpretation from the hearer. So although truths communicated using metaphors are not inferior to literal truth, we also must recognize that the indeterminacy of a metaphor means that the truth they communicate has some "ragged edges" as well.

The Enlightenment's legacy of privileging literal truth has left its mark on biblical studies as well, as it has meant that the goal of finding the "meaning" of a text is to find that to which the text is ultimately referring. In other words, the goal of much of biblical studies is to dispense with the "ragged edges" of the metaphors and symbols in Scripture by finding their underlying "literal" meaning. Of this phenomenon, McFague notes, "[A]fraid that our images refer to nothing, we literalize them, worshiping the icon in our desperation."[168] However, there is no need to sacrifice the verity of biblical metaphor while seeking to appreciate its rich and multivalent possibilities for meaning; we need not literalize biblical metaphor in order to make it say something "true"; it is already true.

Soskice observes that the sciences often rely on models for their explanatory power, and these models aid in forming and testing new hypotheses. For some who see metaphors and models as merely heuristic devices there is a temptation to conclude that these models are only "useful in limited ways as temporary psychological aids…but finally [are] dispensable."[169] However, Max Wartofsky, a philosopher of science, argues that a scientific model would not be useful "if there were not some sense in which the model mirrored some aspect of what it is taken to be a model of."[170] Alex Burri goes even further and claims, "Denn ohne Metaphorik ware die Wissenschaft nicht *unsere* Wissenschaft,"[171] since scientific models are a necessary and integral component of scientific inquiry and explanation. In the same way then, literary metaphors rely on models, and these models create new connections and knowledge for their hearers/readers, knowledge that is only accessible through this particular metaphor. Therefore, this study does not view truth

---

[168] McFague, *Metaphorical Theology*, 10.
[169] Ibid., 133. N.b. This is not McFague's view.
[170] Marx Wartofsky, *Models: Representation and the Scientific Understanding* (Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science 48, London: Reidel, 1979), 38-39.
[171] Alex Burri, "Metaphern, Modelle und wissenschaftliche Erklärgungen," in *Metapher und Innovation: Die Rolle der Metapher im Wandel von Sprache und Wissenschaft*, eds. Henri Lauener, Andreas Graeser, and Gerhard Seel, (Bern: Haupt, 1995), 289 (emph. orig.).

communicated through metaphor as if it were of a lower order than "literal" truth, nor will I attempt to identify the "literal truth" communicated through biblical metaphor. Rather, this study proceeds with the assumption that the biblical authors, in this case Paul, used metaphor to communicate something true to their hearers/readers about who God is and who they were in relation to God.

3.3.2 The Function of Metaphor in Theology

Having said that biblical metaphors are neither reducible to literal paraphrase nor merely a useful heuristic device, it is helpful here to include a few positive remarks about the function and purpose of biblical and theological metaphors. Soskice insightfully remarks, "There are many areas where, if we do not speak figuratively, we can say very little."[172] Thus biblical and theological metaphor is not only a heuristic device, but is indispensable for descriptions of a transcendent God and of the human-divine relationship.[173] As McFague asserts, "Models are necessary, then, for they give us something to think about when we do not know what to think, a way of talking when we do not know how to talk."[174] Furthermore, the biblical authors who employed these models and metaphors believed them to present an accurate, albeit incomplete picture of God (thus the plurality of metaphors). Soskice captures this sentiment well when she states, "Christians respond to the models of their religious tradition not because they take them to be elegant and compelling means of describing the human condition, but because they believe them in some way to depict states and relations of a transcendent kind."[175] In light of the connection between metaphor and transcendent reality, this study proceeds under the assumption that biblical metaphors are foundational, non-paraphrasable, and indispensable for the task of communicating transcendent truths that are accessible only through each specific metaphor.

Since this study operates with a strong view of metaphor, namely, that metaphors "function in the task of saying that which cannot be said in other ways,"[176]

---

[172] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 96.
[173] For a similar discussion on the use of metaphor and model in science and philosophy see Lutz Danneberg, Andreas Graeser, and Klaus Petrus, "Metapher und Innovation," in *Metapher und Innovation: Die Rolle der Metapher im Wandel von Sprache und Wissenschaft*, eds. Henri Lauener, Andreas Graeser, and Gerhard Seel (Bern: Haupt, 1995), 9-21.
[174] McFague, *Metaphorical Theology*, 24.
[175] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 112.
[176] Ibid., 63.

and since it also assumes that metaphors and their underlying models do provide epistemic access to transcendent truths, the final element that requires explanation is how these two elements work together in the interpretive process. In speaking of language acquisition, David Rumelhart observes that in describing a new situation, a young child "must proceed through a process of fitting the aspects of the…situation into the closest lexical concept already available."[177] Likewise in theological metaphor, biblical authors used what they viewed as the closest finite model or state of affairs in order to speak of transcendent things. Vanhoozer observes that "thanks to metaphor, we can set the unfamiliar in the context of the familiar in order to understand it in new ways."[178] In light of this, the task of the exegete is not to find a metaphor's univocal meaning, but to allow the multivalent associations epistemologically accessible through biblical metaphors to shape and structure her perception of the transcendent. Furthermore, rather than attempting to smooth the ragged edges of a metaphor's possible meanings, an interpreter must appreciate that, as Dawes notes, "On the basis of some perceived similarities, [a metaphor]…can help us to discover others, as we trace the implications of the underlying model."[179] Therefore, this study operates under the premise that biblical metaphors, and the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors in particular, function to provide a unique set of associations that are only epistemically accessible through each individual metaphor, and that no biblical metaphor should be thought of as metaphor "for" something else (i.e. adoption is not a metaphor "for" salvation). If we begin with the premise that biblical metaphors are non-paraphrasable, unique, and multivalent in their meaning, then the exegetical task is to embrace the metaphor's ragged edges, to plumb the depths of its meaning, and thereby create a robust account of its theological significance.

4. Conclusion

This chapter began by proposing a working theory of metaphor that was both philosophically defensible and also useful for the exegetical task of interpreting biblical metaphor. While there are many definitions available, and while there is still

---

[177] David Rumelhart, "Some Problems with the Notion of Literal Meanings," in *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed., ed. Andrew Ortony (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 73.
[178] Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text?*, 129.
[179] Dawes, *The Body In Question*, 39.

considerable debate among philosophers of language about the nature and function of metaphor, this study relies on Soskice's definition of metaphor as "that figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another."[180] This definition restricts metaphor to a literary phenomenon, thus binding notions of metaphorical meaning tightly to literary context and distinguishing between a metaphor and the mental states it evokes in readers/hearers. Furthermore, I argued that each metaphor has both a tenor (the primary subject of the metaphor) and a vehicle (the term(s) by which the tenor is described), and that these two parts interanimate in order to produce the metaphor's "two ideas for one." Though a metaphor is, strictly speaking, a literary phenomenon, metaphors all rely on their hearers/readers conjuring an underlying model through which the metaphor's multivalent associations are structured and filtered within their minds. These models draw upon the conventional meaning of words, as metaphorical meaning occurs at the level of a complete utterance rather than individual lexemes, which cannot be said to have "metaphorical meaning." Thus metaphors lead to an "intercourse of thoughts," which has the capacity to shape the perceptions and emotions of their hearers; these features of metaphor will be addressed in the following chapter.

The second part of the chapter sought to deal with several areas of special concern arising from applying Soskice's theory of metaphor to the exegesis of biblical texts. Of particular note for exegesis are the ramifications of treating metaphor as a literary phenomenon that include: the relationship between metaphorical meaning and context, and the indeterminate nature of metaphorical meaning. Of the former, I concluded that since the meaning of a metaphor occurs at the level of a complete utterance, and each metaphorical utterance in the biblical text creates a unique meaning through the interanimation of the tenor and vehicle, it is incorrect to assume that a metaphor's meaning holds steady in all contexts. Thus the latter half of the thesis will treat each occurrence of a Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphor separately, without attempting to reach a synthesized "meaning" of υἱοθεσία in Paul's thought. Moreover, further complicating the interpretive task, I argued that metaphors by nature yield some degree of indeterminacy in their meaning because it is impossible to say precisely which associations of a model will transfer for a particular reader/hearer during a particular reading/hearing. However, I also argued that this

[180] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15.

indeterminacy should not lead us to despair of finding meaning in biblical metaphors, but rather that their "ragged edges" should be embraced and a diversity of their implications explored. Indeed, far from being dispensable heuristic devices, I argued that biblical metaphors aim to provide epistemic access to truths only available through the set of associations they evoke. As Soskice remarks, "The very frames within which we work are given by metaphors which function in structuring not only what sort of answers we get, but what kind of questions we ask."[181] Therefore, if we are to appreciate the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors for their unique perspective on the transcendent, we need to resist the temptation to equate them with other Pauline metaphors, to literalize them into a theological definition or to propose for them a univocal meaning. Instead we must allow the metaphors to structure our questions and categories with the associations and implications they conjure in each of their various manifestations.

[181] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 90.

III. METAPHOR: PERCEPTION, EMOTION, INTIMACY, AND IDENTITY FORMATION

1. INTRODUCTION

In the second chapter I dealt with several issues related to the theoretical question "What is metaphor?" and sought to illuminate several of the contributions contemporary philosophical approaches to metaphor theory can make to the exegetical process. Drawing on theories of metaphor from various philosophers of language, I examined metaphor as a literary phenomenon that binds metaphorical meaning to a specific literary context, which by nature produces a certain level of indeterminacy in its meaning, and also creates epistemic access to knowledge only apprehensible through a particular metaphor. However, the theoretical approach taken by philosophers of language is not the only way of analyzing metaphor. Researchers in fields such as cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics, anthropology, and contemporary rhetoric and communication take a more practical approach to the study of metaphor, and there has been a considerable amount of research devoted to analyzing metaphor in terms of its potential for persuasion and influence over its readers/hearers. It is uncommon to combine aspects of cognitive theories with philosophical theories within a single study, however I contend that these seemingly disparate approaches each can contribute tools to biblical exegesis that complement rather than exclude other approaches.

A philosophical approach to metaphor, as seen in the first chapter, primarily seeks to understand *what metaphor is*. In this chapter we will shift our focus to the practical question: "*What does metaphor do*?" – a question that is equally important for approaching and analyzing metaphor in biblical exegesis. Metaphors have long been recognized as performative utterances in which "to *say* something is to *do* something,"[1] or put differently, a metaphor actively creates and constructs a particular perception of its subject for its intended audience.[2] Gaventa observes that a metaphor

[1] J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things With Words* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 12.
[2] Following Austin, Röska-Hardy argues, "Die Wirkungen, die wir dem Phänomen der Metapher zuschreiben, sind demnach die perlokutionären Folgen einer vom Sprecher/Autor absichtlich ausgeführten Sprachhandlung, welche bei der Interpretation der Sprachhandlung durch den Hörer/Leser entstehen" ("Metapher, Bedeutung und Verstehen," 139).

> provokes reflection and even insight. Metaphors ask us to change our minds… If a metaphor does work its way with us, however, it forces us to consider things differently. It alters our perspective.[3]

In order to provide a fuller picture of what metaphors are and how they work, this chapter discusses the performative features of metaphor in terms of their cognitive and affective capacities. This chapter examines the capacity of metaphors (1) to structure thought and influence the perceptions of individuals, (2) to evoke emotions and to cultivate intimacy between people, and (3) to create and foster a unique identity and ethos when used in the context of a particular community. The task in this chapter is to illustrate how metaphor works in these capacities, and to do so I will consider both extra-biblical and biblical examples of metaphors functioning to influence perception, emotion, intimacy, and identity, which will be defined below. These examples are intended to illuminate the methodology and show its relevance for the analysis of the biblical text. Thus when biblical examples are used they are not intended to be taken as a detailed or complete exegesis, but rather they were chosen to illustrate a particular facet of the methodology that will be applied in much greater detail in my exegesis of the υἱοθεσία metaphors in the second part of the thesis.

Before moving to the analysis of these three areas, a few further preliminary remarks regarding two key presuppositions in other studies on the υἱοθεσία metaphors should be made. First, previous studies on the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors have tended to operate under the assumption that metaphors are neutral conduits of information rather than productive and performative utterances.[4] However, this chapter will show that a metaphor is not a passive description of a subject, but rather it is an active agent that *does something* (e.g. alters perceptions, structures thoughts, influences attitudes). A metaphor's ability to shape and influence perception has been widely documented and discussed in the field of rhetoric and communication, and thus there is ample support for treating biblical metaphor as an active agent with persuasive capacity.[5] As performative utterances, metaphors actively create particular perceptions, filter out other ways of thinking, and exert powerful influence over

---

[3] Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 10.

[4] This presupposition is especially evident in studies that focus primarily on a metaphor's background; e.g. Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons*; Scott, *Adoption as Sons*; Allen Mawhinney, "*Huiothesia* in the Pauline Epistles: Its Background, Use, and Implications," Ph.D. Diss., Baylor University, 1982.

[5] Recent contributions in New Testament studies that have begun to draw on this research include Gupta, *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul*; Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*; Howe, *Because You Bear This Name.*

attitudes and values.[6] Therefore, it is not enough for exegesis to focus on the background of a metaphor,[7] it also must attempt to delineate the cognitive structure a metaphor provides and the feelings it evokes for a particular experience (or set of experiences) for the audience, which will be discussed in greater detail below.

A metaphor's performative nature is perhaps then particularly evident and relevant in cases of biblical metaphor, as the authors of the New Testament are often strategically using metaphor to provide structure and meaning to particular religious experiences and to form the collective identity of new Christian communities. Lakoff and Johnson note,

> Metaphors have the power to create a new reality. This can begin to happen when we start to comprehend our experience in terms of a metaphor, and it becomes a deeper reality when we begin to act in terms of it.…Much of cultural change arises from the introduction of new metaphorical concepts and the loss of old ones.[8]

Perhaps this is precisely the kind of cultural change Paul was aiming to effect when he used the body metaphor to describe the Christian community in Corinth (1 Cor 12:12-31) and in Rome (Rom 12:4-8), thereby creating a feeling of interdependence between community members. Or in describing the Corinthian church members as vessels of clay containing treasure, Paul is potentially providing a distinctive framework, a distinctive way of thinking about or seeing the world,[9] through which to process the existential experience of Christians living according to the new knowledge of the gospel (2 Cor 4:6-7). If metaphors have the ability to shape and structure one's perception of reality, then biblical exegesis must seek to determine what kind of framework and perception a particular metaphor and its implications creates, and how it exerts such influence over the perception of its audience.

Second, it is not enough to treat only the cognitive potential of a biblical metaphor; an interpreter should also pay heed to a metaphor's affective nature. Studies from the field of sociolinguistics have demonstrated that the use of figurative language increases feelings of intimacy between an author and audience. Since this

---

[6] Frederick Ferré, "Metaphors, Models, and Religion," *Soundings* 51.3 (1968): 331.
[7] The question of background and model will be treated in detail in chapter 4.
[8] Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 145.
[9] Zoltán Kövecses, *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 32-33.

feature of figurative language is purely affective,[10] in some respects it is very difficult to quantify. However, there is ample evidence to support the existence of this feature of metaphor, and thus biblical scholars must consider a metaphor's effect on the evocation of emotion and the creation of intimacy for its intended audience.

Coupled closely with its affective potential is a metaphor's ability to create a certain identity and ethos for group members. Several studies in anthropology and linguistics suggest that symbol and metaphor are among the most powerful tools for shaping, *re*shaping, and structuring the identity and ethos of particular people groups.[11] As McFague remarks, "[R]evolution in language means a revolution in one's world."[12] Group members tend to process their thoughts, actions, and relationships using the structure provided by their dominant metaphors,[13] and thus *changes* in group behavior are closely linked with *changes* in their dominant metaphors. Because metaphors are often closely linked with group identity, in undertaking the exegesis of biblical metaphor an interpreter should also consider how particular metaphors may potentially shape and change a community's identity through their use. Therefore when considering the implications of a biblical metaphor, an exegete must ask how a metaphor might shape or reshape the collective identity of its audience. The following sections will address how metaphors achieve their influence on these four areas (perception, emotion, intimacy, and community identity) and further defend their importance for understanding biblical metaphor in general, and the υἱοθεσία metaphors in particular.

2. Metaphor And the Individual

Admittedly, it is a bit artificial to separate an analysis of the cognitive and affective potential of a metaphor into those attributes pertaining to the individual and those attributes pertaining to community. Certainly an individual gleans and gathers a good deal of his or her cognitive perception, behavior, and belief through belonging

---

[10] This is not to say that the affective and the cognitive are not related, but rather that studies have shown that the affective potential of the metaphor is evident to an outside observer even if he or she fails to understand the metaphor's meaning or reference; see also William Horton, "Metaphor and Readers' Attributions of Intimacy," *Memory & Cognition* 35.1 (2007): 90-93.

[11] See also James W. Fernandez, ed., *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991); Carmen Llamas, and Dominic Watt, eds., *Language and Identities* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010).

[12] McFague, *Metaphorical Theology*, 9.

[13] Victor Turner, *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974), 23-59.

to and participating in a community or communities. However, the distinction is helpful because it allows for analysis both of how metaphors internally structure thought and influence perception and emotion, and also how metaphors influence external relationships and identity at a macro level. Therefore I will proceed through an analysis of metaphor and individual perception and emotion with the assumption that these features of metaphor hold influence over individuals who exist *within community*. Changes in perception within the individual can also result in the formation of a new community perception, and frequently a change in a structural metaphor within a particular community results in a change of perception within the individual. Thus, these two areas of analysis are intended to complement each other and the division between "individual" and "community" is largely a pragmatic distinction.

2.1 Metaphor and Perception

2.1.1 Metaphor and Cognitive Frameworks

Cognitive theorists have persuasively argued that metaphors are powerful cognitive instruments that shape and structure one's perception of the world.[14] In this sense, metaphors are not mere descriptors of reality. Rather, as performative utterances, metaphors themselves are active agents that create and structure their interpreter's perception of reality. According to Richard Lanham this feature is to some degree inherent in all language use, but it is a particularly salient feature of metaphor. Lanham notes, "We perceive the world actively and recreatively; we don't just register a world already 'out there.' To perceive the world is also to compose it, to make sense of it."[15] A metaphor is an author or speaker's "composition" shared with a reader or hearer; it is a figurative device that invites the reader or hearer to "compose" the world in a particular way. As Joel Johnson and Shelley Taylor have argued, "metaphors may function as images around which attitudes are organized, and so exert a deep, if subtle influence on…perception."[16] Thus, part of a metaphor's

[14] See especially Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*; Turner, *Death is the Mother of Beauty*; Gerard Steen, and Raymond Gibbs, eds., *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics* (Philadelphia: J. Benjamins, 2001).
[15] Richard Lanham, *Analyzing Prose*, 2nd ed. (London: Continuum, 2003), 3.
[16] Joel Johnson, and Shelley Taylor, "The Effect of Metaphor on Political Attitudes," *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 2 (1981): 305.

persuasive influence lies in its ability to structure one's perception of reality, sometimes by means of a single image.

Indeed, we often do not appreciate how far metaphorical thinking extends, and we often take for granted some of the basic metaphorical structures that ground our understanding of reality. For example, we often speak about the human mind in terms which are seen to be suggestive of a container.[17] Therefore one's mind can be "filled with good ideas," I can "file something away in the back of my mind," or "dust the cobwebs off of an idea," and we can speak of students "cramming for finals," and ignorant people as "airheads." As Richards notes, the intercourse of words leads to the intercourse of thoughts, [18] and thus a *literary* metaphor also impacts the *cognitive* framework of a reader/hearer and thereby actively creates or recreates his or her perception of reality. It also follows that a change in the underlying metaphor would result in a different cognitive framework and perhaps a different perception of one's reality.[19] For example, if we instead speak of minds in terms which are seen to be suggestive of a field, such as a "fecund brain" or "sowing seeds of doubt" or a "deeply rooted belief," such language produces a different cognitive framework through which to perceive the mind than our original example "the mind is a container" creates.

The performative and creative nature of metaphor is also inherent to biblical metaphors, and thus any undertaking of their exegesis should seek to appreciate the way they are cognitively structuring and restructuring the perception of their intended audience. To take an extended and detailed example that provides a clear cognitive structure we will look at John 10:11-18. In these verses Jesus declares "Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός," speaking about himself in terms which are seen to be suggestive of

[17] See also Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 25-33.
[18] Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 94; Turner argues that there are some root metaphors that are so intrinsic to thought that they form the basis to all literary metaphor (*Death is the Mother of Beauty*, 10-12). *Pace* Lakoff and Johnson, Turner, and other cognitive theorists, Naomi Quinn argues "that metaphors, far from constituting understanding, are ordinarily selected to fit a preexisting and culturally shared model" ("The Cultural Basis of Metaphor," in *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, ed. James W. Fernandez [Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991], 60).
[19] It is worth noting that metaphors such as "THE MIND IS A CONTAINER" are so strongly ingrained that the task of eradicating them would be highly unlikely to succeed (Lakoff and Turner, *More Than Cool Reason*, 62-65). N.b. Within sources from cognitive linguistics conceptual metaphors occur in small caps to denote that these metaphors do not necessarily appear directly in language, but rather compose the conceptual framework of language; this study will utilize small caps for conceptual metaphors.

a shepherd.[20] Drawing on the same metaphor, Jesus as the Good Shepherd states "ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων," and also "γινώσκω τὰ ἐμὰ καὶ γινώσκουσίν με τὰ ἐμά," and further that his sheep "τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούσουσιν." While some might argue that Jesus' words are merely a description of reality, cognitive theories of metaphor suggest that the declaration "Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν" actually creates the new cognitive framework "Jesus is the Good Shepherd" through which the reader now processes his actions and ministry. Thus when hearers of the Fourth Gospel are confronted with Jesus' crucifixion in John 19, one of the cognitive frameworks in operation is Jesus crucified *as* ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν. In this example, the metaphor's performative nature actively creates a new framework through which to interpret and perceive later events in the narrative, giving these events a particular meaning that they would not acquire by means of another metaphor. As Victor Turner observes, "the metaphor selects, emphasizes, suppresses, and organizes features of the principal subject,"[21] which in this case provides a cognitive framework that endows Jesus' death with a particular theological meaning.

Another short but clear example of a metaphor creating a new cognitive framework for its hearers/readers is Paul's declaration in 2 Timothy 4:6, Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι.[22] In speaking of his ministry, and presumably his impending martyrdom, in terms which are seen to be suggestive of a drink offering being poured out, Paul creates with his metaphor a cognitive framework through which his audience is meant to understand the suffering he has endured throughout his ministry and ultimately his impending death. Here then is a prime example of what Lakoff and Turner are referring to when they state, "the power of such a metaphor is its ability to *create* structure in our understanding."[23] The cognitive structure created by Paul's drink offering metaphor brings about the perception that he is facing his martyrdom on his own terms—namely, that he views his suffering and his impending death as something he has undergone willingly in service to God rather than something that

[20] Recall that this study will rely upon Soskice's definition of metaphor as "that figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another" (*Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15); for a more detailed explanation of this definition see section 2.3 of chapter 2.
[21] Turner, *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors*, 30.
[22] I use "Paul" to designate the author here because the letter has traditionally been attributed to Paul, and the framework the metaphor is intended to create in this text remains the same regardless of one's position on the authorship of the letter.
[23] Lakoff and Turner, *More Than Cool Reason*, 62.

has been done *to him* by the Roman authorities. Thus, the metaphor is not merely a description of Paul's suffering and martyrdom, but rather it actively fills these events in Paul's life with purpose and significance for his audience. Without the use of the metaphor in 2 Timothy 4:6, Paul's suffering and martyrdom would not be identifiable as a coherent set of experiences characterized by "drink offering being poured out." Certainly there are other metaphors and other cognitive frameworks that are used,[24] but the audience's perception of Paul's suffering and martyrdom created by the utterance Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι is unique to this metaphor alone. It is important to note that the perception a metaphor creates is not synonymous to its "meaning." Rather, as in the examples above, the cognitive structure creates a framework that might support a number of possible implications or nuances regarding Paul's martyrdom. Taking into account the effect metaphors have on perception, my exegetical analysis of the υἱοθεσία metaphors will consider what perceptions this metaphor creates in each of its four occurrences in the texts of Romans and Galatians.

2.1.2 Highlighting and Hiding

Because metaphors are not mere descriptors but rather actively create a particular perception for an individual, they also highlight certain features of their subject while hiding others. In his analysis of political metaphor, Peter Zhang notes "Metaphor never simply *reflects* resemblances. Rather, it almost always actively asserts a non-necessary connection and smuggles in some disconnections as part of the deal."[25] A poignant example of this type of highlighting and hiding is the common metaphor "time is a thief."[26] When we speak of time "stealing the beauty of youth" or to borrow B.B. King's phrase "[time] will rob you of your years and never return one yesterday,"[27] we focus on those attributes of time (i.e. that it seems to pass too quickly, or that we cannot change the past) that are highlighted in the cognitive framework produced by the metaphor. As Köller remarks, "Metaphern erstarren dann zu Klischees…weil sie die Differenz zwischen Modell und Modelloriginal zu

---

[24] Indeed Paul uses three of them in short succession immediately following: ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἀναλύψεώς μου ἐφέστηκεν. τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα ἠγώνισμαι, τὸν δρόμον τετέλεκα (2 Tim. 6:6-7).
[25] Peter Zhang, "Corporate Identity Metaphor as Constitutive Discourse in Miniature: The Case of New China Life," *ETC: A Review of General Semantics* 68.4 (2011): 381.
[26] Lakoff and Turner, *More Than Cool Reason*, 39.
[27] B. B. King, "Time is a Thief," *Love Me Tender*, MCA CD, 1991.

überspielen versuchen."[28] Furthermore, when we speak about time in this manner we also tend to *operate* according to the metaphor's cognitive framework and *act* as if time somehow is wronging us by progressing forward, that it somehow takes something from us without permission. By highlighting time's tendency to feel as though it is passing too quickly, the "time as thief" metaphor obfuscates the constancy and relentlessness of time's true nature. As Lakoff and Turner aptly remark, "the metaphor of time as thief hides the idea that it is a matter of natural law that everything gets old and dies, and that therefore no one has a right not to."[29] Because of its potential for highlighting certain features and hiding others, metaphor is thus a powerful tool for framing and influencing one's perception; it creates, as Gerald O'Brien states, "an easily understood and digested package" of a particular point of view.[30]

Though this feature of metaphor is not typically considered in exegesis, biblical metaphor also highlights and hides, subtly (and sometimes overtly) shaping one's perception of its subject. One of the clearest examples of this is Jesus' indirect insult to Herod πορευθέντες εἴπατε τῇ ἀλώπεκι ταύτῃ (Luke 13:32). A metaphoric insult almost invariably focuses all of one's attention on a particular negative characteristic of its subject (in this case Herod's wiliness) to the exclusion of others, and thus it is a particularly good illustration of a metaphor's ability to influence one's impression and opinion. It is further worth mentioning that in this highlighting, the metaphorical reference to Herod as a fox actually *creates* a particular perception of Herod for the readers/hearers that hides or excludes all other facets of Herod's personhood from consideration; it does not simply illuminate Herod's "foxlike" qualities.

Likewise, James 3:6-10 contains an extended example of a metaphor clearly aimed at highlighting particular features while hiding others. In his admonishment to control one's speech, James first states καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα πῦρ and then later calls the tongue ἀκατάστατον κακόν, μεστὴ ἰοῦ θανατηφόρου. These two metaphors complement each other to create a powerful perception of the tongue as an agent of

[28] Köller, *Semiotik und Metapher*, 281. Köller here is using "Modell" to refer to the structure or state of affairs that underlies the metaphor, which in turn is based on an "Original" (*Semiotik und Metapher*, 15-19).
[29] Lakoff and Turner, *More Than Cool Reason*, 39.
[30] Gerald O'Brien, "Metaphors and the Pejorative Framing of Marginalized Groups: Implications for Social Work Education," *Journal of Social Work Education* 45.1 (2009): 31.

discord. As cognitive instruments, metaphors construct a vivid mental image for the tendency of careless gossip and slander to spiral quickly out of control. Also, the imagery of a fire burning out of control and of poision spreading highlights the severity of their consequences. Indeed, these two metaphors are so persuasive that it is difficult to think in a different framework about speech and gossip when one is confronted with them. However, both metaphors to some degree hide the role of "listening ears" that contribute to the spread of gossip, framing careless speech as an internal and individual problem rather than a problem perhaps stemming from a negative community ethos. Furthermore, when viewing the problem of divisive and damaging speech through these metaphors it is easy to forget the positive role that speech can play in a community. What each of these examples of biblical metaphor shows, then, is that metaphor is not neutral in its cognitive framing, and therefore part of the interpretive process is to consider the ramifications of a metaphor's cognitive framework. Furthermore, because metaphor is selective and subtle in the way it affects one's perception, the analysis of the υἱοθεσία metaphors will proceed with a level of awareness of what these metaphors are highlighting and what they are hiding in each of their contexts.

Recognizing that metaphors highlight some features and hide others is essential to understanding the powerful influence metaphors exert over perception. When an interpreter or audience ceases to recognize this, then for such a person it seems "as if there are no other ways, no other metaphors, in which people can think."[31] Moreover, when metaphors go unrecognized their meanings are often collapsed into their underlying models, and inappropriate associations are frequently smuggled into their metaphorical meaning. A prime, yet controversial, example of a metaphor that often goes unrecognized is the designation "Father" for the first person of the Trinity,[32] and often the result is that the metaphor creates an inappropriate

---

[31] Raymond Gibbs, *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 142.

[32] The literature on this topic is mammoth, and I recognize that there are many scholars and theologians who assert that the designation "Father" is not metaphorical, but rather is the revealed name of the first person of the Trinity (see esp. Aída Besançon Spencer, "Father-Ruler: The Meaning of the Metaphor 'Father' for God in the Bible" [*JETS* 39.3 (1996): 433-42] for an overview of the relevant literature and a critique in the same spirit as the brief critique I present here). In addition, biblical names are frequently both nominal and metaphorical (e.g. σὺ εἶ Πέτρος), and thus there is nothing inherently contradictory about "Father" being both a revealed name and a metaphor. Moreover, if one were to make an argument for the revealed name of God from Scripture, then surely just as strong of a case could be made for יהוה being the revealed, non-metaphorical name of God. I am also not suggesting

perception of God for the hearer who fails to recognize the relationship between metaphor and model. For example, the well-known and somewhat controversial pastor John Piper asserts,

> God has revealed himself to us in the Bible *pervasively* as King, not Queen, and as Father not Mother. The second person of the Trinity is revealed as the eternal Son. The Father and the Son created man and woman in his image, and gave them together the name of the man, *Adam* (Genesis 5:2). God appoints all the priests in Israel to be men. The Son of God comes into the world as a man, not a woman…From all of this, I conclude that God has given Christianity a masculine feel.…He has ordained for the church a masculine ministry.[33]

While Piper is surely correct in identifying that "Father" is a dominant metaphor, it does not follow that the metaphor "Father" implies the maleness of the first person of the Trinity.[34] Although feminine imagery predicated of the first person of the Trinity is less frequent than masculine imagery, the counter examples of feminine imagery and characteristics attributed to God still demonstrate the inappropriateness of Piper's claim of Christianity being ordained to have an inherently "masculine" feel. Thus it is troubling that in identifying the first person of the Trinity, the Father, as inherently masculine rather than feminine, which evidences the collapse of the metaphor into its underlying model, Piper filters out all of the maternal and feminine imagery predicated of God in Scripture (e.g. Deut 32:13, 18; Psalm 22:9-11; Isa 45:9-12; Hos 11:1-4). In contrast, Sallie McFague argues that "while God is imagined in masculine as well as in feminine metaphors, the divine is neither male nor female but embraces and transcends both."[35] The point here is not about tallying up the masculine and feminine images to see which gender is a truer reflection of the first person of the Trinity. Rather, what Piper's statement shows is the power of metaphor to implement a particular cognitive framework such that it becomes seen as *the single correct way*

---

that the designation "Father" is dispensable, or that it does not truly refer to God's being, but rather I am pointing out that as a metaphor, there are some parts of the underlying model "Father" (e.g. maleness to the exclusion of femaleness, or anatomical begetting) which do not transfer.

[33] John Piper, "'The Frank and Manly Mr. Ryle': The Value of a Masculine Ministry," *JBMW* 17.1 (2012): 10.

[34] This is by no means a new assertion; indeed Gregory of Nyssa remarks that the distinction between male and female "has no reference to the Divine Archetype" (*On the Making of Man* 16.14 [*NPNF* 5:406]).

[35] McFague, *Metaphorical Theology*, 168.

to view a particular subject, and such that the distinction between a metaphor and its underlying model is lost.[36]

As seen in the examples above, one of the dangers of metaphors is that they tend to hide other ways of thinking from view, particularly if they are well-worn and culturally dominant.[37] As O'Brien observes, "[A]fter a particular conceptual metaphor is widely embraced as an apt way of viewing the target, it may be extremely difficult to replace it with a contrasting mode of framing the issue."[38] In Piper's statement, his acceptance of the masculine metaphor to the exclusion of all others makes a rather glaring omission for orthodox theology; it hides the third person of the Trinity—the Holy Spirit—completely from view. This is an especially troubling result of the acceptance of Christianity's "inherently masculine feel" since it would be rather difficult for Piper to give an account of the "masculine" gender of the Holy Spirit, just as it is without foundation to argue for the "feminine" gender of the Holy Spirit, who nevertheless is most often described using feminine and neuter terms (i.e. רוּחַ, πνεῦμα).[39]

What Piper's statement demonstrates is that when an interpreter ceases to recognize that a particular metaphorical framework is at play (in this case "God is Father") it is often difficult for him or her to avoid ascribing all of its entailments to its subject – even the ones that are inappropriate (i.e. God being male in gender). In light of the evidence above, I would suggest that Piper's statement about Christianity reveals *his* misunderstanding of the nature of metaphors far more than it gives credence to the notion that orthodox Christianity is "inherently masculine." As Kenneth Burke notes, "*many of the 'observations'* [e.g. since God is Father then Christianity must be masculine] *are but implications of the particular terminology in terms of which the observations are made*."[40] In Piper's case his "observations" regarding his collection of masculine metaphors and male figures in Scripture lead him to the conclusion that Christianity is inherently more masculine than feminine.

---

[36] In light of the tendency to view "Father" as a more "literal" designation than "mother" McFague has argued, "[T]he model of 'God the father' has become an idol. When a model becomes an idol, the hypothetical character of the model is forgotten and what ought to be seen as *one* way to understand our relationship with God has become identified as *the way*" (ibid., 9 [emph. orig.]).

[37] For more on metaphor and cultural identity see section 3 below.

[38] O'Brien, "Metaphors and the Pejorative Framing," 32.

[39] For a good analysis of the difficulties caused by ascribing gender to the Holy Spirit see Paul K. Jewett, "The Holy Spirit as Female?" *Reformed Journal* 28.4 (1978): 10-12.

[40] Kenneth Burke, *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1966), 46 (emph. orig.).

Piper's assertion in this case is thus the necessary consequence of his acceptance of masculine language and imagery as *the framework* rather than *a framework* through which God is revealed. I mention this here because like the masculine metaphor "Father, (ὁ πατήρ)" "adoption to sonship (υἱοθεσία)" has the potential to reinforce the "masculine feel" of the biblical text. This need not be the case if we understand that all of the entailments of a metaphor's underlying model do not necessarily transfer, and if we consider that this metaphor is not intending to make a statement about the superior ontological status of one gender over the other, but rather is borrowing an image from the surrounding culture to structure the shape and perception of what it means for a believer to be ἐν Χριστῷ.[41] Piper's statement demonstrates precisely why it is important to consider what features are being highlighted and hidden by biblical metaphor so as to not fall prey to the belief that they are the *only way of thinking about a particular topic*.

2.2 Metaphor and Emotion

If metaphor theory in general has been moderately neglected by biblical scholars, then it is fair to say that research from other fields on the effects of metaphor on an individual's emotions has been left nearly untouched.[42] To be fair, research documenting the affective and emotive potential of metaphorical language is far scarcer than research on its cognitive effects. Since the question of precisely *why* and *how* metaphors affect one's feelings is far more complicated than even questions regarding cognition, Joel Johnson and Shelley Taylor observe that research in sociolinguistic and psycholinguistics has largely ignored "the impact of language in general, and metaphor in particular, upon attitude formation and change."[43] However, this is beginning to change, and William Horton notes that "the current findings suggest quite clearly that people are able to generate assessments about particular uses of language that go far beyond the interpretations of specific words and phrases."[44]

---

[41] See section 2 of chapter 1 for a more thorough treatment of translation and gender-inclusive language.
[42] Gaventa mentions it briefly in her introduction (*Our Mother Saint Paul*, ix-xi); and Howe has a more sustained interaction with metaphor and beliefs (*Because You Bear This Name*, 92-94; 185-232).
[43] Johnson and Taylor, "The Effect of Metaphor on Political Attitudes," 305.
[44] Horton, "Metaphor and Readers' Attributions of Intimacy," 93.

Further complicating matters is the tendency among biblical scholars to view the text as a conduit or container of "meaning" which needs to be "extracted."[45] This metaphorical framework—which largely goes unnoticed—does not lend itself easily to the analysis of the *affective* potential of a text. However, there are equally compelling reasons to see the biblical text as something to be "experienced" as one would a drama or a musical performance.[46] Perhaps then what biblical scholars sometimes miss when analyzing a text is similar to what musicologists miss when analyzing a musical score. Of this tendency Simon Firth observes, "the emphasis was…on the qualities of a [musical] work in space, structural qualities, rather than on the qualities of a work in time, the qualities of immediacy, emotion, sweat."[47] Since metaphor as a form of figurative language is by nature artistic, it should not be surprising that like other artistic disciplines, it is also affective and emotive—and these attributes reveal themselves as the story of the text is told *in real time*. As Raymond Collins observes, metaphor "appeals not to the intellect with its ability to calculate advantage and disadvantage for the future but rather to the sensate person, endowed with emotion and with sight, hearing, touch, taste, and smell."[48] Following Collins' sentiment, I propose that metaphor in the biblical text is not only something to be analyzed for its cognitive content, but it is also something to be *experienced* for its emotive and affective potential. Indeed, the success of a metaphor is often dependent on a reader, or a community of readers, being persuaded to *feel* a certain way about a subject, and not solely on its ability to communicate cognitive content.[49] Though the experiential aspects of metaphor are perhaps more difficult to describe and quantify than its cognitive content, they are certainly no less significant.

---

[45] The "text as conduit" metaphor is thus a prime example of how a metaphor's framework determines the "appropriate" course of action – in this case, analytic exegesis. For further explanation see Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 126-38; for a sustained critique of the conduit metaphor in language see Michael J. Reddy, "The Conduit Metaphor: A Case of Frame Conflict in Our Language about Language," in *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed., ed. Andrew Ortony (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 164-201.

[46] For example: (1) the orality and collectivity of the cultures that produced the text, (2) the public and liturgical nature of its history, and so on. Studies that focus on the narrative quality of the biblical text also tend to presuppose the text as drama; e.g. Richard Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002); Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *The Drama of Doctrine: A Canonical-Linguistic Approach to Christian Theology* (Louisville: WJK, 2005).

[47] Simon Firth, "Music and Identity" in *Questions of Cultural Identity*, eds. S. Hall and P. du Gay (London: Sage, 1996), 116.

[48] Raymond Collins, *The Power of Images in Paul* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008), 7.

[49] That is not to say that there is a clean division between a metaphor's emotive and cognitive content. As Soskice observes, "We cannot conceive of emotive 'import' apart from a cognitive content which elicits it" (*Metaphor and Religious Language*, 27).

The emotional thrust of a metaphor begins with the speaker's selection of a particular metaphorical utterance, which may be motivated by a speaker's *feelings* just as much as by his or her *thoughts*. As William Horton points out, metaphors "typically do more than simply convey specific meaning—they also imply a great deal about the speaker's feelings and attitudes toward the interpersonal context."[50] When an audience receives a speaker's metaphor, the audience is asked not only to join in the speaker's vision that is created by the metaphor, but also to empathize with the speaker's feelings associated with the metaphor. Ted Cohen writes,

> When your metaphor is '*X* is *Y*', you are hoping that I will see *X* as you do, namely as *Y*, and, most likely, although your proximate aim is to get me to see *X* in this way, your ultimate wish is that I will feel about *X* as you do.[51]

In Cohen's view, the cognitive content of a metaphor is but a bridge to the ultimate goal of fostering shared *feelings* about a particular subject. Wayne Booth comes to a similar conclusion stating, "To *understand* a metaphor is by its very nature to *decide* whether to join the metaphorist or reject him, and that is simultaneously to decide either to be shaped in the shape his metaphor requires or to resist."[52] Especially in political rhetoric and propaganda, there are numerous examples of metaphors that are chosen specifically for this type of affective potential.[53] The most extreme examples include: (1) The depiction of Jews as rats, vermin, devils, or talk of "The Final Solution to the Jewish Question," in Nazi propaganda,[54] (2) the portrayal of the Tutsi minority as "cockroaches" in radio broadcasts by the Hutu majority,[55] (3) numerous media sources in the United States who speak of undocumented workers in terms suggestive of an infectious disease or a pollutant,[56] and so on. What is significant about these metaphorical portrayals is certainly not their cognitive content, but the visceral reactions they evoke. Pests and vermin are meant to be exterminated, diseases are meant to be fought, and thus these metaphors foster powerful feelings of revulsion

---

[50] Horton, "Metaphor and Readers' Attributions of Intimacy," 87.
[51] Cohen, *Thinking of Others*, 23.
[52] Booth, "Metaphor as Rhetoric," 63.
[53] For a specific analysis of the persuasive effects of political metaphor see Köller, *Semiotik und Metapher*, 276-90.
[54] See also Randall L. Bytwerk, "The Argument for Genocide in Nazi Propaganda," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 91.1 (2005): 37-62.
[55] See also Bill Berkely, "Sounds of Violence: Rwanda's Killer Radio," *New Republic* 211 (1994): 18-19.
[56] J. David Cisneros, "Contaminated Communities: The Metaphor of 'Immigrant as Pollutant' in Media Representations of Immigration," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 11.4 (2008): 569-601.

toward their subjects that have been historically accompanied by the heinous treatment of the people groups they target.[57] Although Paul's letters to Rome and Galatia are not necessarily as rhetorically charged as political propaganda, neither are they dry, cerebral pieces of writing. Thus they must be read with attention to their emotive content in addition to their capacity to communicate cognitive content.

Certainly the most significant obstacle to a theory that seeks to integrate the cognitive and affective components of a metaphor is the difficulty in determining and assessing a metaphor's capacity to influence the thoughts and feelings of its audience. This is particularly true for biblical metaphors, as the audience in question is no longer directly accessible and thus the effects of the metaphor cannot be measured by any kind of quantitative study.[58] Moreover, there is no firm consensus on how to speak about, assess, or quantify "emotion," which further complicates the exegetical task. Although theories of emotion from the areas of psychology, philosophy, and anthropology abound,[59] this study will utilize a theory of emotion put forth by Zoltán Kövecses, who argues that emotional meaning is both body-based (i.e. "anger" is a physiological response) and socially constructed (i.e. "anger" as a concept has a particular social, ideological, and pragmatic function within a particular culture).[60] Furthermore, Kövecses argues that when analyzing language in general, and metaphor in particular, a more pertinent question to consider is how emotion is conceptualized in language, and whether "metaphors simply reflect a preexisting, literal reality" or if they "actually create or constitute our emotional reality?"[61] Kövecses asserts that emotions are conceptualized through a variety of structural metaphors such as:

EMOTIONS ARE SUBSTANCES INSIDE A PERSON/CONTAINER, ATTRIBUTES ARE POSSESSED

---

[57] The persuasive ability of these metaphors is what leads Booth to undertake an in-depth analysis of the ethics of metaphor (*The Company We Keep: An Ethics of Fiction* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988], 293-373).

[58] Studies on the affective capacity of metaphors have been carried out in recent years by several scholars, e.g. Pradeep Sopory, "Metaphor and Intra-Attitudinal Structural Coherence," *Communication Studies* 59.2 (2008): 164-81; Raymond Gibbs, "Metaphor Interpretation as Embodied Simulation," *Mind & Language* 21.3 (2006): 434-58; David S. Miall, and Don Kuiken, "A Feeling for Fiction: Becoming What We Behold," *Poetics* 30 (2002): 221-41.

[59] See esp. S. Schachter, and J. Singer, "Cognitive Social, and Physiological Determinants of Emotional States," *Psychological Review* 69 (1962): 379-99; Anna Wierzbecka, "Everyday Conceptions of Emotion: A Semantic Perspective," in *Everyday Conceptions of Emotion*, eds. James Russell (et al.), (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1995), 17-45; Andrew Ortony, Gerald Clore, and Alan Collins, *The Cognitive Structure of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

[60] Zoltán Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 1-19; 114-138; 182-200.

[61] Ibid., 1.

OBJECTS, EMOTIONAL CLOSENESS IS PHYSICAL CLOSENESS, EMOTION IS FORCE, EMOTION IS PHYSICAL AGITATION, AN EMOTIONAL RELATIONSHIP IS A DISTANCE BETWEEN TWO ENTITIES, and IMPORTANT IS CENTRAL.[62] Moreover, Kövecses demonstrates a high degree of universality for these structural metaphors, and indeed many are identifiable in expressions of emotion in the biblical text. For example, Paul's assertion that the Corinthians have become "puffed up" (ἐφυσιώθησάν) utilizes the conceptual metaphor EMOTIONS ARE SUBSTANCES INSIDE A PERSON/CONTAINER to communicate that pride causes the container (person) to swell (1 Cor 4:18). Jesus' emotion upon encountering the grief for Lazarus is depicted as physical agitation (EMOTION IS PHYSICAL AGITATION), where the text records he was "deeply moved (ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτὸν)" (John 11:33). As I will demonstrate, these conceptual metaphors for emotion are also identifiable in the Pauline texts containing the υἱοθεσία metaphors, and thus provide a mode of inquiry for identifying how the emotional content of these passages might have been conceptualized for Paul's audience. Thus, in each exegetical chapter the conceptual metaphors of emotion will be identified in the text surrounding the υἱοθεσία metaphors, and then I will propose possible conceptual links between the emotional content and the cognitive content communicated by the passages in which the υἱοθεσία metaphors occur.

However, it is not enough to simply identify Paul's use of emotive language or conceptual metaphors of emotion. One is still left to consider how Paul's use of the υἱοθεσία metaphors elicit an emotional response from his audience members. Once again, measuring the response of the audience is unavailable, although contemporary scholars have begun to investigate the effects of textual metaphors on the emotions and moods of the reader and have discovered a strong link between metaphor and the evocation of emotion.[63] Research in this area has uncovered a strong link between metaphor and a sense of personal participation or identification with the narrative and characters in the text.[64] From a theoretical perspective, Booth argues that metaphors impose narratives and imply a story, which in turn invite the hearers/readers to

[62] Ibid., passim.
[63] E.g. Miall and Kuiken, "A Feeling for Fiction," 221-41; Trent S. Parker, and Karen S. Wampler, "Changing Emotion: The Use of Therapeutic Storytelling," *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy* 32.2 (2006): 155-66.
[64] See e.g. Miall and Kuiken, "A Feeling for Fiction," 238-39; Don Kuiken (et al.), "Locating Self-Modifying Feelings within Literary Readings," *Discourse Processes* 38.2 (2004): 267-86; Sopory, "Metaphor and Intra-Attitudinal Coherence," 175-78.

participate in that story with all of the attendant emotions that accompany it.[65] Booth further claims that a metaphor's narrative "invites us to come and live within a given culture, sharing the assumptions of all who live there. Our entire way of life is thus at stake."[66] Thus according to Booth's theory, when confronted with a υἱοθεσία metaphor, Paul's audience enters into the narrative imposed by the metaphor and experiences its attendant emotions, clues of which are present in the conceptual metaphors of emotion that are latent in the literary context. Therefore, any analysis of the affective content of the metaphor also needs to concern itself with the larger narrative the metaphor, and its accompanying conceptual metaphors of emotion, that is extended as an invitation to the audience.

The insights of Kövecses and Booth are most easily illustrated through several brief examples from the biblical text. A prime example of an extended biblical metaphor that is aimed specifically at cultivating a shared perspective and emotional response is the story (or parable) that Nathan tells David in 2 Samuel 12:1-6 to call him to account for his treatment of Uriah.[67] In the story, Nathan tells David of a rich man who, though he had great wealth and many sheep, took the single ewe lamb of his poor neighbor. Moreover, the poor man's ewe lamb would "lie in his bosom" and "was like a daughter to him" (2 Sam 12:3). Under Kövecses' description of conceptual metaphor this detail of the text communicates the preciousness of the ewe lamb by invoking the metaphor EMOTIONAL CLOSENESS IS PHYSICAL CLOSENESS, which heightens David's sense of indignation at the poor man's separation from the ewe lamb. Also interesting and significant for us here is that the text pointedly remarks on David's emotional state upon hearing the story: "David's anger was greatly kindled against the man" (2 Sam 12:5). In this description we see the emotion anger conceptualized in the metaphor ANGER IS HEAT/FIRE, a conceptual metaphor that has a high degree of universality across cultures and likely communicates not only an emotional, but also a physical and bodily response.[68] Moreover, the text's mention of this emotion confirms Booth's theory, meaning that David's emotional response

[65] Booth, *The Company We Keep*, 169-96; 293-320.
[66] Ibid., 335.
[67] A parable meets our definition of a metaphor because it is an extended example of speaking of one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another: e.g. speaking about the kingdom in terms which are seen to be suggestive of sowing seeds (Matt 13:24-30), a mustard seed (Matt 13:31-32), a treasure hidden in a field (13:44-50), etc.; see also Cohen, *Thinking of Others*, 19-27.
[68] Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion*, 170.

indicates that David had accepted the implicit invitation to participate in the narrative and enter into the world created by the text. Indeed, Nathan's reaction to David confirms Booth's hypothesis as well. Once Nathan had garnered the affective response he needed from David, he was able to exclaim, "You are the man!" and redirect David's appropriate feelings of anger toward David's own misdeeds (2 Samuel 12:7). In this case, the metaphorical story is effective because its narrative creates David's feelings of indignation, and it is the reality of David's emotional response that ultimately move him to his acts of repentance.

The same type of appeal to empathy and affective response is seen in many of Jesus' parables. The Lucan parable of the Good Samaritan is effective because it seeks to illuminate the issue of neighborliness by asking its hearers to empathize, that is "to feel along with," "a certain man" (ἄνθρωπός τις);[69] it requires the reader to think "imagine if you were…." After recording the distant emotional responses from the priest and the Levite (Luke 10:31-32), responses that perhaps invoke a conceptual metaphor such as PHYSICAL DISTANCE IS EMOTIONAL DISTANCE, the text records that the Samaritan was "moved with pity (ἐσπλαγχνίσθη)," which illustrates Kövecses' assertion that emotions are conceptualized as physical forces, and that important or significant things are center.[70] Moreover, in the narrative the Samaritan's emotional response acts as the impetus that drives him to action, suggesting that the conceptual framework of emotion as a physical force often results in spurring the experiencer of that emotion to some sort of outward action.[71] The parable ends with Jesus asking the question τίς τούτων τῶν τριῶν πλησίον δοκεῖ σοι γεγονέναι τοῦ ἐμπεσόντος εἰς τοὺς λῃστάς; (Luke 10:36). In using δοκέω, which in the LXX and in several uses in the NT "emphasises the subjective character of a statement" (e.g. Gen 19:14; 38:15; Matt 17:25; Luke 1:3), [72] Jesus is asking the lawyer (ὁ νομικός) to offer his subjective and internal interpretation of the parable, one that relies on his ability to imagine himself in the place of ἄνθρωπός τις. The question Jesus puts to the man therefore implicitly asks him to imagine himself in the position of the man who has been

[69] Joel Green remarks, "The choice of opening, 'a certain man,' constitutes a powerful rhetorical move on Jesus' part…Stripped of his clothes and left half-dead, the man's anonymity throughout the story is insured; he is simply a human being, a neighbor, in need" (*The Gospel of Luke* [NICNT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997], 429).
[70] Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion*, 83-85.
[71] Ibid., 77-82.
[72] *TDNT*, 2: 233.

robbed, to become an active participant in the world created by the narrative. As the man imagines himself in the position of the man who was robbed, he also is invited to experience all of the attendant feelings that accompany someone who has been robbed. Thus, Jesus' question invites the man to judge his own question καὶ τίς ἐστίν μου πλησίον; (Luke 10:29) through the feelings evoked by Jesus' parable.

Additional parables that have an implicit appeal to empathy and emotion include the Parable of the Lost Sheep (Luke 15:1-7) the Parable of the Lost Coin (Luke 15:8-10), and the Parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15:31), which are also rife with emotionally charged language (*συγχάρητέ* μοι…οὕτως *χαρὰ* ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ [Luke 15:6-7] *συγχάρητέ* μοι…γίνεται *χαρὰ* ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ [Luke 15:9-10], ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ καὶ *ἐσπλαγχνίσθη* [Luke 15:20], *εὐφρανθῆναι* δὲ καὶ *χαρῆναι* ἔδει [Luke 15:32]), and begin with an explicit invitation for the hearers to imagine themselves as participants in the story (τίς ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ὑμῶν; [Luke 15:4]). Thus, as Jesus tells the story (or as a reader reads that Jesus tells the story) the Pharisees, scribes, tax collectors, and sinners (and the readers/hearers of Luke's Gospel) experience the feelings of the one who finds the sheep, the woman who finds the coin, and probably to some degree the feelings of the prodigal son, his brother, *and* his father. Given the prevalence of the emotionally charged language in these examples, it would seem that one of their primary intentions is to create empathetic feelings in their audience; in some sense, to *understand* the meaning of the parables is to *experience* the feelings they are intended to evoke.

Although, for clarity, the examples just examined are parables that make an overt and easily identifiable appeal to their readers/hearers to enter into the world created by the narrative, in the exegetical portion of the thesis I will show that the same kind of invitation, and a condensed narrative, is present in each occurrence of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors. Moreover, Booth argues that "the most powerful effects result when we have expended a great deal of mental energy reconstructing an image from minimal clues."[73] Thus according to Booth a metaphor's narrative need not be explicitly stated in the text for it to effect an emotional response from the audience. The next section of this chapter will attempt to integrate a metaphor's ability to shape perception and emotion with its ability to cultivate intimacy between

[73] Booth, *The Company We Keep*, 298.

an author and audience, and to promote a unique community identity among its participants.

3. Metaphor and Community

In addition to its ability to shape an individual's perceptions and emotion, metaphor is a powerful device for fostering intimacy between an author and audience and between audience members. As such, metaphors are particularly well-suited to creating a particular ethos and identity for a community, especially when they are integrated into a community's distinctive vocabulary. In the sections below I will examine some of the evidence from sociolinguistics and communication research which demonstrates how and why metaphors are effective for cultivating intimacy and constructing identity, and then draw some conclusions on the salience of this research for the interpretation of the υἱοθεσία metaphors.

3.1 Metaphor and the Creation of Intimacy

If a metaphor's primary *modus operandi* within the realms of cognition and emotion is to influence by shaping and reshaping one's perception, then a correlative effect is a shared sense of intimacy between the metaphor-maker and the audience. By "intimacy" I do not necessarily mean collegiality or rapport, but rather that metaphors have the ability to single out those who understand, and thus participate in the metaphor, from those who do not.[74] In this way, metaphors create bonds between their makers and their understanders. The intimacy a metaphor creates is best thought of as the mutual recognition of a "sameness of vision" between the author and audience or between audience members.[75] It is as if the author is saying "I know that you know that I know that *we* have a shared understanding of *X*," and in the case of many biblical metaphors, "a shared understanding of ourselves as *X*." This intimacy, this recognition of a sameness of vision, can occur both between author and audience, and it also can be something an author seeks to foster between audience members – both of which are features to consider in the analysis of metaphor in the biblical text.

---

[74] Of intimacy, Horton remarks "Individuals who dislike each other strongly could nevertheless be quite well acquainted and therefore still be considered to be in some sense 'intimate'" ("Metaphor and Readers' Attributions of Intimacy," 89).

[75] Cohen, *Thinking of Others*, 22.

3.1.1 Intimacy Between Author and Audience

It is worth stating at the outset that communication is by its very nature a joint action undertaken by at least two individuals, both of whom belong to certain social groups and bring certain presuppositions to any communicative act.[76] As Herbert Clark points out, "People entering a joint activity presuppose a great deal about carrying out that activity."[77] An "activity" can refer to a conversation between a cashier and a customer, a lesson in a classroom, a conversation at a bus stop, *ad infinitum*.[78] Likewise, the biblical authors made certain assumptions about their intended audiences, their intended audiences also made assumptions about the authors, and thus the composition and reception of Scripture is a joint action under Clark's definition.[79] Successful communication largely depends on the identification of *common ground* between the author and audience, which Gibbs defines as "a common stock of experiences, interests, and sensibilities…[and] specific information about one another's knowledge, beliefs, and attitudes."[80] Metaphors, along with many other forms of figurative language, exploit the common ground between an author and an audience, as their meaning is not always recoverable to those lacking the proper background. In this way, metaphors not only allow the speaker to communicate a unique meaning but also solidify the distinction between two audiences: "one in the 'know' and one 'in the dark.'"[81] It also is worth noting that when speakers use a metaphor they do so with the assumption that those whom they intend to understand will in fact understand what they are communicating.[82] Therefore, when a speaker uses a metaphor and is successfully understood, two things have happened: (1) the speaker has successfully identified and utilized some shared experience or understanding with the audience, and (2) by understanding the metaphor the audience now has received its communicated message *and also understood the bond with the author on the basis of their common ground*.

---

[76] Herbert H. Clark, *Using Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 29-58.
[77] Ibid., 44.
[78] Ibid., 34.
[79] The situation is slightly more complicated in the case of the biblical text because of its history of interpretation. One could say that one builds upon layers of these communicative acts each time the Scripture is read in a new context.
[80] Gibbs, *The Poetics of Mind*, 134.
[81] Albert N. Katz, "Preface," in *Figurative Language Comprehension: Social and Cultural Influences*, eds. Herbert L. Colston, and Albert N. Katz (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2005), ix. This solidification of group boundaries is discussed in more detail in section 3.2 below.
[82] Of course it is also possible that the speaker will be unsuccessful and the readers or hearers will not understand, but the fact remains that speakers assume that they will be understood by their audience.

Conversely, if a hearer fails to understand a metaphor it is because he or she lacks the necessary common ground with the author. Thus, metaphors are excellent tools for establishing what common ground exists between an author and audience, and also for establishing boundaries around a particular community.

Like the hypothetical examples given in Clark's analysis, an author's identification and exploitation of common ground is a key component in the successful use of metaphors in the biblical text as well. It is quite clear from their choices of metaphors that the biblical authors presuppose certain shared beliefs, knowledge, and attitudes, and this *common ground* acts as a foundation for their metaphors. The metaphors then further reinforce the content of this common ground, creating a bond of intimacy between the author and the audience based on their mutual recognition of their shared knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, and experiences. A good example of the identification and exploitation of common ground through a metaphor occurs in Ephesians 2:14, which reads Αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἓν καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας, τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ. In this text, the metaphor "enmity is a dividing wall" relies on and reinforces several key pieces of common ground: (1) the mutual recognition of the previous conflict and separation between the two groups ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἕν, (2) a shared understanding of the Law and covenants such that they would constitute a "wall" between ἀκροβυστία and περιτομή (Eph 2:11-12) and (3) a shared experience of Christ's peace.[83] This metaphor casts the shared experience and attitudes of the author and audience into sharp relief (i.e. their mutual commitment to Christ) while also subtly erecting a new "wall" around the community in its purview. Here Paul is successful in creating a bond with his audience to the degree that the audience buys into the imagery he puts forth to interpret their experience with Christ. Thus, this metaphor not only has the potential to change their internal perception of their experience with Christ, but also has the potential to foster a more intimate connection with the author who shares in their "sameness of vision."

When an author uses a metaphor to highlight the common ground shared between members of a particular group, he or she is utilizing a *social function* of figurative language to increase feelings of interpersonal closeness. Gibbs suggests,

[83] This metaphor utilizes many additional less salient pieces of common ground, such as (1) living in the Roman Empire, (2) an understanding of who constituted ethnic Israel, and so on.

"Many instances of metaphor function beyond their conventional content to signal intimacy, formality, or hostility or to indicate membership in a particular subgroup."[84] Sometimes the targeted subgroup of a metaphor is small and easily identifiable, and sometimes, as in the case of advertising or political campaigns, it is more open-ended. For example, the book title *Loving the Little Years: Motherhood in the Trenches* speaks about motherhood in terms which are seen to be suggestive of a war.[85] In so doing, this book appeals to a particular community (mothers) which has a certain set of common experiences by virtue of being mothers. There are multitudinous books on parenting that do not have metaphorical titles, but the brilliance of using a metaphorical title is that it immediately makes the reader feel as if the author knows how she is *feeling* rather than merely describing the contents of the book. The metaphor in this title appeals to the "sameness of vision" that all mothers share by virtue of being mothers – namely, that motherhood sometimes feels as if we are all involved in some sort of epic and prolonged battle (though the "enemy" might change from day to day).

Metaphors can also appeal to the common ground of a more exclusive subgroup and utilize terminology that is practically unintelligible to non-group members. For example, the director of a jazz band could tell his lead trumpet player to "spend more time in the woodshed," which would communicate both propositional and social content. From that metaphor the trumpet player would know that the director (1) wanted her to go home and practice before the next rehearsal and (2) considered her part of the "in" group of musicians who understood the metaphor's reference without further explanation. Furthermore, the band director's use of figurative language is more likely to motivate the player to practice than the equivalent "you need to go home and practice" because it appeals to the player's sense of community and belonging within the particular subculture "musicians." In this way, the metaphor "spending time in the woodshed" both draws upon and reinforces the intimate bond between the director and the trumpet player.

In utilizing and reinforcing common ground, metaphors foster feelings of interpersonal closeness between an author/speaker and audience.[86] Thus William

---

[84] Gibbs, *The Poetics of Mind*, 136.
[85] Rachel Jankovic, *Loving the Little Years: Motherhood in the Trenches* (Moscow, ID: Canon Press, 2010).
[86] And in certain cases, between audience members, which will become clear in chapters 5-7.

Horton asserts, "Speakers may produce particular figurative expressions partially in order to emphasize the nature of their relationships with their addressees,"[87] and further, "figurative expressions also enable speakers to achieve other, more socially oriented objectives…An especially important goal that may be fulfilled through the use of nonliteral language is the creation and recognition of interpersonal bonds."[88] What Horton's research demonstrates for biblical exegesis is that there is a need to consider the possible social, and perhaps even ecclesiological implications of a metaphor, as metaphors "may generate inferences about social relationships *alongside* more meaning-driven comprehension processes."[89]

Some of the most fascinating examples of biblical metaphors that have easily identifiable social functions are Paul's use of maternal images in 1 Thessalonians and Galatians. In these letters Paul describes himself in terms of a nurse caring for her children (τροφὸς θάλπῃ τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα [1 Thess 2:7]) and as a pregnant woman in labor (ὠδίνω μέχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν [Gal 4:19]). Though these verses certainly convey theological content, they also assuredly accomplished certain social goals. Though it could be argued that the intimacy achieved through these descriptions is in large part due to the intimate nature of the imagery itself (a mother nursing; a woman laboring), the intimacy created by these metaphors extends far beyond their cognitive content. What creates intimacy in the case of these metaphors is primarily the *vulnerability* Paul displays by describing himself in terms seen to be suggestive of a nurse and a woman in labor. Furthermore, by choosing such a striking image, Paul is highlighting particular features (common ground) of his previous relationship with the churches at Thessalonica and Galatia, drawing attention to their shared membership in the community of believers by means of the metaphor. Thus, Paul's choice of metaphor not only communicates theological content,[90] but also serves the social function of strengthening the bond of intimacy between his audience and himself. Gaventa argues, "The paraenetic function of these metaphors [infants, nurses, and fathers] goes hand in hand with their social function. By invoking the

[87] Horton, "Metaphor and Readers' Attributions of Intimacy," 93; Horton's conclusions were reached by conducting three quantitative studies comparing people's perceptions of intimacy in situations where literal language was used with situations where speakers used figurative language.
[88] Ibid., 87.
[89] Ibid.
[90] I do not mean to suggest that these metaphors serve *only* a social function, as both have rich theological implications in addition to their social functions. For a good analysis of the theological content see Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 25-27, 34-39.

language of family, Paul implicitly exhorts believers to continue in those relationships."[91] Paul makes use of the same type of appeal in the υἱοθεσία metaphors in their various contexts, which are both intimate in content and also creates intimacy by drawing on the shared experiences between Paul and his audience.

3.1.2 Intimacy Between Audience Members

The metaphors in the New Testament occur in communicative exchanges between an author and *a group of addressees* who together form a community. Thus it is beneficial for us to consider the possibility that metaphors can effect feelings of intimacy *between* members of the communities they address in addition to fostering intimacy between an author and an audience member. In the same way authors can utilize the common ground held between themselves and their audience members to foster feelings of intimacy, they also can employ metaphors that draw attention to common ground that audience members share. To use a metaphorical description, the initial cultivation of intimacy between an author and an audience member grows and branches out to include shared feelings of intimacy between group members as well. For clarity's sake, I will rely on Clark's definition of a community as a group of people with "a shared system of beliefs, practices, nomenclature, convictions, values, skills…that members of the community assume they can take for granted in other members."[92] As mentioned above in the discussion on common ground, members of a community share "inside knowledge," and sometimes the knowledge or shared experience is *ineffable* to outsiders. Clark concludes that among these ineffable experiences "we might include such experiences as how a woman feels in a male society (and vice versa), how a member of a minority group feels, and how it feels to be a born-again Christian. These experiences are the ultimate inside information."[93] When an author uses a metaphor to describe this type of "insider" experience, the performative nature of the metaphor is simultaneously shaping the members' perception of its subject and also drawing attention to the shared "sameness of vision" between community members, inviting them to recognize their common bond. We will see how each of these elements is achieved in several examples below.

---

[91] Ibid., 27.
[92] Clark, *Using Language*, 102.
[93] Ibid., 110.

Communities quite often have a set of idiosyncratic expressions, metaphors, jokes, proverbs, and so on as part of their community vocabulary.[94] Figurative language, and metaphor in particular, can often function as a kind of shorthand when it is used between members of a particular community.[95] For example, describing the book of Galatians as "a theological minefield," as one of my colleagues recently did to a group of students, is an abbreviated way of implying that there are quite a few interpretive issues to navigate and touchy theological debates to consider when working through a translation. It also suggested to the students that they should work carefully through their translations so as to avoid setting off one of these theological "mines." This metaphor "worked" on several levels: (1) it communicated a message to the students about the content of Galatians, (2) it utilized and reinforced the common ground between the students and the speaker as exegetes of the New Testament and (3) it increased the feelings of camaraderie between the class members as they "soldiered on" together through their translations. By highlighting their common experience and group membership, the metaphor my colleague used helped the students recognize, among other things, that they were all in it together.

The New Testament authors are equally shrewd in choosing their metaphors to highlight the common ground their audience members share with one another. Vivid examples of this are the metaphorical references to "circumcision of the heart" or "spiritual circumcision" as a contrast to physical circumcision (Rom 2:25-29; Col 2:11-15, cf. Gal 5:2-3; 6:13-15; Eph 2:11; Phil 3:2-3). Frequently this metaphorical reference is applied with inclusive plural pronouns (e.g. ἡμεῖς γάρ ἐσμεν ἡ περιτομή [Phil 3:3]), which increases the likelihood of it fostering a sense of intimacy and shared experience between community members.[96] Since "spiritual circumcision" (Ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμήθητε περιτομῇ ἀχειροποιήτῳ [Col 2:11]) is by definition one that cannot be seen outwardly (ἐν τῷ φανερῷ ἐν σαρκὶ περιτομή [Rom 2:28]), and since it is also clear that Paul sees it as a mark of membership in the Christian community, the metaphorical description "circumcision" becomes a tool for highlighting a

[94] See also David L. Ritchie, and Char Schell, "'*The Ivory Tower'* on an '*Unstable Foundation'*: Playful Language, Humor, and Metaphor in the Negotiation of Scientists' Identities," *Metaphor and Symbol* 24.2 (2009): 90-104.

[95] Sam Glucksberg, and Boaz Keysar, "How Metaphors Work," in *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed., ed. Andrew Ortony (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 422.

[96] Horton observes, "Use of the plural pronoun *we* has been shown to affect judgments of the quality and closeness of interpersonal relationships" ("Metaphor and Readers' Attributions of Intimacy," 88).

powerful shared experience for the community members. By using the metaphor to highlight this shared experience among community members Paul is able to increase their interpersonal bonds and also presumably minimize their areas of difference or conflict.[97] Though they are most often analyzed for their theological content, the "soteriological" metaphors in the Pauline corpus (justification, redemption, reconciliation, adoption, etc.) also highlight the shared experience of their audience members, thereby increasing their intimacy while minimizing their perceived differences. A metaphor's creation of intimacy between audience members thus has a profound potential for ecclesiological as well as the more standardly recognized soteriological implications.

3.2 Metaphor and Group Identity

In the first part of this chapter I demonstrated that metaphors affect the way people perceive reality by highlighting certain features of a subject and hiding others. In the previous section above I have shown that metaphors increase the feelings of interpersonal closeness between author and audience and among audience members by drawing attention to their common ground. In this section I combine these two features of metaphor in looking at how metaphors influence and construct group identity. It is important to note that not all metaphors have an impact on group identity. Certainly there are metaphors, such as metaphors in literature or metaphors in poetry, which are only intended to reach individual readers, and conversely, there are some metaphors that are so ingrained that they have little chance of functioning to distinguish one group from another.[98] However, when a metaphor is used repeatedly to describe a shared experience of a community, or when it becomes part of a community's vocabulary, it exerts a subtle yet profound influence over the community's understanding of its identity.

---

[97] Ibid.

[98] Though even ingrained metaphors are often culturally contingent and act as boundary markers around a particular culture (Carmen Curcó, "On Mosquitoes and Camels: Some Notes on the Interpretation of Metaphorically Transparent Popular Sayings," in *Figurative Language Comprehension: Social and Cultural Influences*, eds. Herbert L. Colston, and Albert N. Katz [Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2005], 283-307).

3.2.1 Metaphor and The Nature of Group Identity

There is not space here, nor is it my intention, to undertake a full-scale analysis of the formation of group identity, which is a complex and nuanced topic that has been extensively treated elsewhere.[99] Rather, I will concern myself with the more modest proposal that metaphors (and the υἱοθεσία metaphors in particular), along with other factors, might have played a role in shaping how the early Christian communities perceived themselves and their relationships with "outsiders." The consensus among most sociologists and social-anthropologists is that identity is best described as a dialectic relationship "through which self and other are reciprocally essentialised,"[100] with the recognition that "identity" means different things to different groups. In speaking of group identity, Asano states

> The identity of an individual cannot be discussed in isolation from the opinion of "others." The process of "identity" can thus be understood as located both in the core of the individual and within his or her greater communal culture, emphasizing the relationship between the individual and society for understanding one's own identity. Collective identity…is found both in the core of communal culture (the particular collectivity) and in the aggregate society at large in which the group is located.[101]

As numerous cultural-anthropological studies have demonstrated,[102] a community's symbols, rituals, and language play a significant part in the formation of its collective identity. Simon Firth aptly states, "Identity is thus necessarily a matter of ritual, it describes one's place in a dramatized pattern of relationships,"[103] and further, "Identity…comes from the outside not the inside; it is something we put or try on, not something we reveal or discover."[104] As I described earlier in the chapter, a

---

[99] See especially Atsuhiro Asano, *Community-Identity Construction in Galatians: Exegetical, Social-Anthropological and Socio-Cultural Studies* (JSNTSup 285, London: T & T Clark, 2005) for a study that has integrated insights from cultural anthropology into an analysis of the biblical text; see also Anthony P. Cohen, *The Symbolic Construction of Community* (London: Tavistock, 1985); Richard Jenkins, *Social Identity*, 3rd ed. (London: Routledge, 2008).
[100] Jon Mitchell, "Identity," in *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*, eds. Alan Barnard, and Jonathan Spencer (Hoboken: Taylor & Francis, 2010), 368.
[101] Asano, *Community-Identity Construction*, 37.
[102] See especially Turner, *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors*; Emiko Ohnuki-Tierney, "Embedding and Transforming Polytrope: The Monkey as Self in Japanese Culture," in *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, ed. James W. Fernandez (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991), 159-89; Deborah Durham and James W. Fernandez, "Tropical Dominions: The Figurative Struggle over Domains of Belonging and Apartness in Africa," in *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, ed. James W. Fernandez (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991), 190-212.
[103] Firth, "Music and Identity," 125.
[104] Ibid., 122.

community's metaphors often function as a kind of shorthand for their common experiences, and here I suggest that they also function as an "identity marker" that community members can "try on" or "aggregate around."[105] Because metaphors have somewhat fluid and flexible meanings and a range of potential implications, they are ideally suited to the task of constructing an identity for a community that is both stable enough to function as a boundary marker and fluid enough to easily fit and adapt to the individual differences between community members.[106] In the following sections I will briefly examine how these dynamics of stability and elasticity allow metaphors to solidify group boundaries and embody group experience.

3.2.2. Metaphor and Solidifying Group Boundaries

We saw in the previous sections that a metaphor influences the perceptions and emotions of individuals and, as a counterpart, in this section I will argue that within a group a metaphor "anchors and choreographs the collective consciousness."[107] Within groups, metaphors construct and solidify boundaries for group members by their ability to supply a filter through which group members can delineate the "in-group" from "outsiders." We can see this filtering function well in the example I gave above of spiritual circumcision in contrast to the circumcision of the flesh (Rom 2:25-29; Col 2:11-15, Gal 5:2-3; 6:13-15; Eph 2:11; Phil 3:2-3), or in more contemporary metaphorical labels such as "white collar," "blue collar," and "redneck." When group members use these labels to describe themselves, or when group leaders use them to describe the collective, the metaphors organize and structure the collective consciousness such that the world is split between "circumcision" and "uncircumcision" or between "blue collar" and "white collar," and a stable boundary is formed around the group. It is also worth pointing out that these metaphors often do not merely illuminate boundaries that already exist, but rather as performative utterances they aid in creating them. Zhang observes that metaphor "offers a way in which a collectivity can come into being in the first place."[108] In the most insidious cases, such as in the cases of the political propaganda campaigns accompanying genocide that were mentioned above, the performative

---

[105] Asano, *Community-Identity Construction*, 35.
[106] Ibid., 39.
[107] Zhang, "Corporate Identity Metaphor," 388.
[108] Ibid.

nature of metaphor creates boundaries so absolute that they utterly devalue the "others" and strip them of their humanity itself. Even in less extreme cases, such as describing a spouse as "my other half," the metaphor still constructs and solidifies a stable and firm boundary around the married couple and excludes all other people (since the metaphor necessitates that there are only two halves to a whole).

Metaphors also create boundaries around the collective through highlighting the shared common ground between community members. Gaventa remarks, "If metaphor creates boundaries around a community it also creates barriers against outsiders, against those who 'just don't get it.'"[109] To illustrate this principle, Cohen gives a rather funny example of his father and a friend describing a deficient brand or bottle of beer as "green beer." In recounting this, Cohen remarks,

> Although I have tried and tried—by talking and by tasting—I have never known what these men were talking about. I often agreed that the beer wasn't perfect. I found it flat or stale or bitter, but none of those is what 'green' means. I frankly don't care too much whether we like the same beers…but I desperately want to know what a beer tastes like when it tastes green.[110]

In Cohen's case, the metaphor is unintelligible because he does not share the common ground necessary to join the community of green beer drinkers, and thus the metaphor creates a boundary around that particular community. Perhaps a parallel example from the New Testament would be Paul's description of Christ as Ἰουδαίοις...σκάνδαλον (1 Cor 1:23) but for the "insiders" of the Corinthian community Christ is ὁ θεμέλιος (1 Cor 3:10-15). These metaphors create boundaries between insiders and outsiders by appealing to the common ground and experiential knowledge the Corinthians share regarding who Christ is. Other examples of metaphorical descriptions of shared group experiences among early Christian communities include being: "washed," "sanctified," and "justified" (1 Cor 6:11), and "crucified with Christ" (Gal 2:20; Rom 6:6-7). Though outsiders might be able to understand in part what it might mean for a Christian to describe him or herself as "crucified with Christ," or "sanctified," only those inside the community share the necessary common ground of experiential knowledge to fully appreciate the metaphor, and thus the metaphor has formed a boundary.

---

[109] Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 12.
[110] Ted Cohen, "Some Philosophy: 1," *Raritan* 10.2 (1990): 30.

3.2.3 Metaphor as an Embodiment of Group Identity

If the stability of a metaphor's meaning aids in creating boundaries around a particular group, then its elasticity of meaning permits group members to adapt and "stretch" it to fit their individual differences while still speaking to the common ground of the collective. Zhang observes that metaphors "are simultaneously consubstantiating and individuating," and a metaphor "opens up a psychological space for individuals to co-inhabit."[111] When a community takes up a metaphor, it becomes an embodiment of identity and experience both for the individual and the collective as a whole. As Raymond Gibbs articulates, "metaphors are primary devices for the representation of experience…it is clear that metaphor provides the basis for communities' understandings of some aspects of their collective experience."[112] A prime example of this is the kinship metaphor applied to members of early Christian communities in numerous instances in the New Testament. The metaphor "community is a family" underlies the references to "brothers and sisters," "God the Father," and if God is Father then by extension Jesus is both "Son" and "brother," (Rom 8:29).[113] Furthermore, Paul can speak of Timothy as his "true son" in the faith (1 Tim 1:2; Titus 1:4), himself as both a mother (1 Thess 2:7; Gal 4:19) and a father (1 Thess 2:11), and the members of the community as his children (1 Cor 4:14; 2 Cor 6:13; Gal 4:19). Given the prevalence of this metaphor in the New Testament epistles, it is clear that "community is a family" embodies the collective identity (or at least one facet of it) of early Christian communities.

Furthermore, as performative expressions of the collective identity, metaphors create space for group members to experience and participate in the collective identity by "trying on" or "aggregating around" the metaphor. As figurative and evocative language, metaphors give voice to the experiences of community members; they become for the community embodiments of their collective joy, sorrow, pain, struggle, protest, alienation, and so on. Billie Holiday's well-known rendition of "Strange Fruit" by Abel Meeropol is a beautiful and haunting example of a metaphor's potential to express and embody collective experience.

Southern trees bear strange fruit,

---

[111] Zhang, "Corporate Identity Metaphor," 388.
[112] Gibbs, *The Poetics of Mind*, 192.
[113] *Pace* Aasgaard, *"My Beloved Brothers and Sisters,"* 145-50; Aasgaard's argument regarding Paul's family map in Romans 8 will be addressed in more detail in section 1.2 of chapter 6.

> Blood on the leaves and blood at the root,
> Black body swinging in the Southern breeze,
> Strange fruit hanging from the poplar trees.
>
> Pastoral scene of the gallant South,
> The bulging eyes and the twisted mouth,
> Scent of magnolia sweet and fresh,
> Then the sudden smell of burning flesh!
>
> Here is fruit for the crows to pluck,
> For the rain to gather, for the wind to suck,
> For the sun to rot, for the trees to drop,
> Here is a strange and bitter crop.[114]

This song, originally written by Abel Meeropol, a Jewish schoolteacher from New York, was written to express Meeropol's outrage at the injustice and evil of lynching in the South.[115] Though Meeropol penned the song, it was made famous by Billie Holiday who sang it, according to James Cone, as "a prophetic call for blacks to take up the cross of black freedom because nobody was going to carry it for them."[116]

To call the metaphor "strange fruit" a "description" of the black experience of lynching is to deny both its power and its potency. The powerful message of "Strange Fruit" created a space within the collective of black culture to rage and cry out against the racial injustice; the metaphor became a symbol of their pain and protest. Cone states that within the black community, "Strange Fruit" "addressed the deep-down hurt that blacks felt and gave them a way to deal with it," and it was "what we had in place of freedom."[117] Cone's words speak to the power of the metaphor to give voice, both to the black community as a whole and to the individuals who comprise it, to their experience of oppression. Such is the nature of a metaphor's elasticity; as symbols of the identity of the collective they are easily stretched and adapted to suit the differences of individual community members. To America at large, "Strange Fruit" was a lens sorely needed to show lynching culture, which was too often portrayed by white newspapers in language more appropriate for a

---

[114] Abel Meeropol, "Bitter Fruit," *The New York Teacher* January (1937).
[115] David Margolick, *Strange Fruit: The Biography of a Song* (New York: Ecco Press, 2001), 13.
[116] James H. Cone, *The Cross and the Lynching Tree* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 2011), 138.
[117] Ibid., 138-39.

carnival, for what it really was, a reality of unthinkable public displays of evil that most Americans still would rather not face.[118]

Though the metaphors used in early Christian communities are further removed by time and space, I would suggest that some were just as powerful and influential as embodiments of group experience in their time as "Strange Fruit" was during the early part of the 20th century. The believers in first-century Christian communities too often filled out the New Testament's narrative of suffering with their own flesh and blood. And while the metaphors of the New Testament are rich in theological significance, *they also give voice to the experiences of the first followers of Jesus*. Just as "Strange Fruit" became a symbol of black protest, so too "being crucified with Christ" (Gal 2:20) or "being poured out like a drink offering" (2 Tim 4:6) or "carrying the marks of Jesus" (Gal 6:17) were phrases and symbols that embodied the collective identity of the early Christians. Likewise, metaphors like "justification," "redemption," and "adoption" are embodiments of the collective experience of what it means to be ἐν Χριστῷ and create psychological space for the community to express their joy and thanksgiving. Since metaphors can act as formative agents within collective identity, in the exegetical chapters we will consider how the υἱοθεσία metaphors in particular might have expressed, embodied, and shaped the collective experience of the churches in Rome and Galatia.

4. Conclusion

The intention of this chapter was to provide a methodological complement to the features of metaphor addressed by philosophical metaphor theories. As stated previously, philosophical and practical approaches are not typically integrated into a single methodology. However, because biblical metaphors have both textual and extra-textual features, a methodology is needed that addresses the impact metaphors have on both of these areas. In order to address a metaphor's impact on extra-textual features, this chapter has considered the cognitive and affective potential metaphors

[118] W. Fitzhugh Brundage states "Perhaps nothing about the history of mob violence in the United States is more surprising than how quickly an understanding of the full horror of lynching has receded from the nation's collective historical memory," quoted in Cone, *The Cross and the Lynching Tree*, 152.

have on their hearers/readers, and has sought to demonstrate the relevance of these areas for exegesis. It began by examining how metaphors influence an individual's perception by providing a particular cognitive framework that highlights some features of a subject while hiding others. The following section contemplated the potential of metaphors to evoke emotions within an individual, which in some cases holds more sway than a metaphor's cognitive content. I then discussed a metaphor's capability of creating intimacy between author and audience and between audience members by drawing on their shared common ground to create a "sameness of vision" and feelings of interpersonal closeness. The last part of the chapter dealt with the complex topic of metaphor and group identity, where I suggested that the elasticity and stability of metaphors makes them ideally suited to create and solidify boundaries between group members and outsiders and function as embodiments of group experience.

The features of metaphor discussed in this chapter are not often utilized in an analysis of a biblical metaphor, but I will show in the second part of this thesis that they bring a richness to the understanding of Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphors that has largely gone unnoticed. Attending to the extra-textual features of the υἱοθεσία metaphors will open new areas of inquiry, such as the metaphors' ability to elicit a variety of emotional responses from their audiences, and the potential impact the υἱοθεσία metaphors have on forming or reforming community identity around the metaphorical *familia Dei* where ethnic distinctions are preserved but are no longer salient. However, before proceeding to the exegesis of the adoption texts I will first focus on filling in the underlying cultural model of υἱοθεσία.

IV. SKETCHING THE MODEL: THE BACKGROUND AND CONVENTIONAL USE OF ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ

1. Introduction

The connection between metaphor and model was already briefly discussed in the second chapter of this study,[1] but here it is necessary to analyze the underlying model for the metaphorical uses of υἱοθεσία in more depth. In the second chapter I noted that metaphors rely on models in order to communicate meaning to the audience. Recall also that this study will rely on Greg Dawes's definition of a model as "a consistent imaginative construct or (if one prefers) a consistent pattern of thought by means of which apparently isolated phenomena may be seen to be related to one another."[2] For the purpose of this study's working definition of metaphor, a metaphor's model is the object or state of affairs that exists in the "real world" that provides the underlying structure for a metaphor. For example, Black's metaphor "Man is a wolf" relies on the model "wolf" as the concrete object that provide the metaphor's structure and framework.

However, since metaphors do not always appear in the form "*X* is a *Y*," it is important to state here that the model need not necessarily be a term present in the text of a metaphor. We observe this in Alfred Lord Tennyson's "Crossing the Bar."

> Sunset and evening star
> And one clear call for me!
> And may there be no moaning of the bar,
> When I put out to sea.[3]

Here Tennyson relies on the extended metaphor of a ship putting out to sea and "crossing the bar" (the sandbar that acts as a barrier between the shallow harbor and the deep sea beyond) as a poetic description of death. Notice that this metaphor evokes several models, which possibly include: a ship, the tide, the harbor, and the sea beyond. Taking Dawes's definition then, Tennyson's poem nudges the reader to imagine death through "the consistent pattern of thought" of a ship journeying over the bar to the ocean beyond. However, only the bar is explicitly mentioned in the text.

---

[1] See section 2.3 of chapter 2.
[2] Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 38.
[3] Alfred Lord Tennyson, "Crossing the Bar," lines 1-4.

Indeed, powerfully evocative metaphors often only allude to their underlying models rather than stating them overtly. Soskice notes, "It is the capacity of the lively metaphor to suggest models that enable us to 'go on' which gives the clue to the richness of metaphorical description."[4] Tennyson's evocation of a ship, the bar, and the sea beyond allows the reader to 'go on' quite awhile in her ruminations about death's journey. Is the harbor calm and peaceful? Is the weather cloudy, misty, or clear? Will the ship move smoothly across the bar, or will it moan, as Tennyson fears? Perhaps most significantly, "Crossing the Bar" illustrates that much of the selection and association of models occurs in the mind of the reader as he or she encounters the written words of the author. Tennyson may have had a particular ship and a particular bar in mind, but it is not in the nature of metaphor to demand that his audience associates precisely the same set of models that he himself envisioned. However, the vocabulary of the metaphorical utterance also, to some degree at least, constrains the possible models the reader is likely to associate. For example, although "bar" has the potential to evoke concrete objects, places, or states of affairs that are unrelated to Tennyson's poem (e.g. a piece of metal or wood, a drinking establishment, and so on), the frame of the metaphorical utterance eliminates such models from consideration because of its nautical terminology (e.g. the sea, the sunset, and the clear call). Thus although metaphors often evoke a plurality of models, some models are more salient than others because of the constraints imposed by the frame of the metaphorical utterance.

Furthermore, neither do the models invoked by a metaphor need to have a one-to-one correspondence with the vehicle of the metaphor. Take for example T.S. Eliot's "The Hollow Men,"

> We are the hollow men
> We are the stuffed men
> Leaning together
> Headpiece filled with straw. Alas!
> Our dried voices, when
> We whisper together
> Are quiet and meaningless.[5]

Though it may be possible to argue that Eliot's metaphor "We are the hollow men," framed in an "*X* is a *Y*" construct picks out the particular model "hollow men,"[6] the

[4] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 51.
[5] T. S. Eliot, "The Hollow Men," lines 1-7.

adjectival metaphor "dried voices" conjures up a range of possible models or, as Soskice observes, "entities of which the term would customarily be predicated."[7] "Dried" might lead the reader to associate withered grass, dried meat, dried flowers, dry wood, dry skin, and so on. However, the possibility for a plurality of models, or the lack of a one-to-one correspondence between a metaphor and its model, need not trouble us if we remember that the function of the model is to provide the framework through which the metaphor's tenor and vehicle are related to one another in the mind of the reader/hearer. Certainly "withered grass" and "dried meat" both provide a "consistent pattern of thought" for the metaphor, it is just not the *same* pattern of thought. Therefore, readers who associate different models will understand, perceive, and be affected by the metaphor in slightly different ways. This is an important feature of the relationship between a metaphor and its possible models that must be kept in mind during the exegetical process.

Because a model provides the underlying structure of a metaphor, it is by entertaining various aspects of a model that the audience is moved to discover and consider a metaphor's diverse implications. To take a simple example, the metaphor "the brain is a computer" relies on "computer" as its underlying model, and as such allows its reader to entertain implications like: "thoughts are electric impulses," "memories are saved on the hard drive," or memories as "files" can become "corrupt," brains can be "hardwired" for certain behaviors, and so on. Since biblical metaphors also rely on models to provide the framework through which to consider their implications, the first step toward determining possible implications of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors must be the delineation of their possible underlying model or models. Moreover, determining the possible underlying models for the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors is especially important since contemporary interpreters are spatially and temporally removed from its original setting, and thus care must be taken that current notions are not imported into the underlying model.

The model (or models) which underlie the υἱοθεσία metaphors are closely connected with the conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία. By "conventional" I mean the general semantic field of the word as it occurs in non-figurative settings.[8] However, a

---

[6] Though it is still difficult to say precisely what Eliot means by "hollow men."
[7] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 50.
[8] This is not necessarily to say that the conventional meaning of a word is always nonfigurative (e.g. the "stem" of a glass or the "leg" of a table are both conventional and figurative), but the lexical

metaphor's model is not synonymous with its conventional definition. This is easily observable in our example of "dried voices" where "dried" evokes images of dried things, and the models are not restricted to the conventional meaning "free of moisture." Rather, in addition to the conventional meaning, the model underlying a metaphor also includes the possible images, feelings, and associations that might accompany it. Therefore sketching the model for the υἱοθεσία metaphors must also ask questions such as: What sorts of people were adopted? What social connotations did adoption carry? What circumstances typically gave rise to a father's choice to adopt? What did the legal act of adoption accomplish? What texts or traditions would a person familiar with Jewish practices be likely to associate with adoption? For answers to these questions it is necessary to go beyond the evidence for the legal procedures and examine the cultural assumptions and social mores that form the foundation for the legal practices of first-century adoption. Furthermore, the relationship between the model of υἱοθεσία and the identification of its appropriate background, which has been the focus of several previous studies, must be rethought. I will show below that a model cannot be reduced to a single background text, that possible backgrounds and texts cannot be neatly separated from one another, and that it is likely that each possible background both interprets and is interpreted by the others.

Rather than pinning a strictly Jewish, Greek, or Roman background to υἱοθεσία,[9] this chapter will weigh all of these possible models because each has the possibility of contributing to the overall meaning of the metaphors in its Pauline context, as both the author and the audience members could feasibly have been influenced by all three backgrounds. The analysis below will also demonstrate that casting a wide net for the possible models of the υἱοθεσία metaphors is necessary because of the indeterminate nature of metaphors as communicative acts.[10] Though previous studies on the possible background of the Pauline use of υἱοθεσία have tended to focus on the most likely background with regard to authorial intent, I argued in the previous chapter that Paul's intended meaning as the author is only one part of

---

evidence that determines the conventional meaning for υἱοθεσία is almost entirely nonfigurative. The connection between model and conventional meaning is also discussed in section 2.3.2 of chapter 1.

[9] This has been the approach of many previous studies on the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors; e.g. Byrne, *"Sons of God"*; Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons*; Scott, *Adoption as Sons*; Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*.

[10] This was discussed in detail in 3.2 of chapter 1.

the communicative process.[11] Rather, metaphors by nature, invite the *audience* to explore a range of possible implications that cannot be wholly determined by the author. Therefore, since the letters were read in the context of community, and the communities at Rome and Galatia were comprised of diverse social and ethnic backgrounds, consideration must be given to all possible models υἱοθεσία might potentially conjure for the various perspectives present within the original audience.[12]

2. Conventional Meaning, Background, and Translation: Some Methodological Considerations

As seen in the examples above, a metaphor's model consists of the associations and thought structures created by its conventional word meaning or semantic domain.[13] Therefore, studies that investigate the appropriate background and conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία are helpful insofar as they delineate its semantic range; determining the conventional meaning of the word aids in selecting or ruling out various models or imaginative constructs. Necessarily then, the appropriate translation of υἱοθεσία is of central concern because its translation is an attempt by exegetes to pick out the appropriate conventional meaning and background of the metaphor. In the case of υἱοθεσία there are two possible translations scholars have put forth: "sonship" and "adoption." The sections below will first examine the evidence for the conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία and then evaluate two possible translations of υἱοθεσία in the Pauline texts.

---

[11] The role of the audience is discussed in more detail in section 3 of chapter 3.

[12] It is my contention that the ethnic composition of the communities in question were predominantly composed of gentiles but may have included a Jewish minority. This issue will be addressed more thoroughly in the introduction to the exegetical chapters on Romans and Galatians (see section 1.2 of chapter 5, and 1.1 of chapter 6). Suffice to note here that there have been some recent proponents of a solely Gentile background for Romans and Galatians, who therefore see Paul's use of adoption as a way of legitimating Gentile converts; see especially Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*. Hodge is highly influenced by Stanley Stowers, who states that "the letter [Romans] characterizes its readers unambiguously as *gentile Christians*" (*A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994], 30). Stowers also argues that interpreters who purport that Paul's letter might have been addressed to a mixed audience "ignore or disallow the letter's explicitly encoded audience" (ibid). Stowers and Hodge believe Paul was concerned with constructing a new community norm for Gentile converts, and not with changing or challenging the accepted community norms of Judaism; see also Mark Nanos, "What Was at Stake in Peter's 'Eating with Gentiles' at Antioch?," in *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation*, ed. Mark Nanos [Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002], 300-316.

[13] See also the discussion on model and conventional meaning in section 2.3.2 of chapter 1.

2.1. The Conventional Meaning of Υἱοθεσία

It is necessary to begin with an assessment of the semantic domain of υἱοθεσία in order to lay the appropriate foundation for the underlying models of the Pauline metaphor. Determining the conventional definition of υἱοθεσία must involve an examination of the legal and social uses of the word, and in light of previous studies it must also consider the possibility that Paul is evoking a concept from Jewish texts even if υἱοθεσία itself does not appear in these texts. In delineating the conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία it is important to bear in mind James Barr's warning that, "as soon…as the social acceptation of words is neglected…an opening is given to those interpretations which…are remote from the actual semantic indication."[14] Thus in heeding Barr's warning the translation of υἱοθεσία in the Pauline text must attend to its social use that would have been recognizable to Paul's first-century audience alongside the concern to bring out possible theological meanings of υἱοθεσία as it relates to Israel's history.

Reasons for beginning with the best-attested conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία become clearer if we consider a simple example where a small divergence in conventional meaning results in a greater divergence in the meaning of a metaphorical utterance. For example, the Greek word δοῦλος unequivocally denotes "a service which is not a matter of choice for the one who renders it, which he has to perform whether he likes it or not, because he is subject as a slave to an alien will, to the will of his owner,"[15] and it is translated "slave" when predicated of persons literally in bound service to another or when the metaphor indicates a negative relationship between the δοῦλος and his or her master.[16] However, δοῦλος is often translated "servant" when it is a metaphorical predicate of a positive slave/master relationship.[17] Presumably to soften the connotations of "slave" for the contemporary reader in the NRSV, Paul is designated a "servant of Jesus Christ (Παῦλος δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ [Rom 1:1]), the disciples make the transition from "servants" to "friends" of Jesus (οὐκέτι λέγω ὑμᾶς δούλους … ὑμᾶς δὲ εἴρηκα φίλους [John 15:15]), and 2 Timothy gives moral guidance for those wishing to be a "servant of the Lord" (δοῦλον δὲ κυρίου οὐ δεῖ μάχεσθαι ἀλλ' ἤπιον εἶναι πρὸς πάντας [2 Tim 2:24]). However,

---

[14] James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), 213.
[15] *TDNT*, 2: 261.
[16] E.g. Matt 6:24; 13:27; Luke 7:2; John 8:35; Rom 6:16-17 NRSV.
[17] E.g. Rom 1:1; 2 Tim 2:24; Rev 15:3 NRSV.

translating δοῦλος with "servant" rather than "slave" slightly alters the underlying model a contemporary reader associates with these metaphorical predications. While the translation and corresponding model of "servant" may reflect an individual's voluntary submission to God or Christ and make the designation more palatable to contemporary sensibilities, it misses the element of "ownership" or "lordship" that is most certainly present in the model of "slave." The translation "servant" loses the totality of Paul's submission to Christ as δοῦλος in Romans 1:1,[18] and it potentially misses the enormity of the change in the disciples' status in John 15:5. Thus deriving a translation from the best-attested conventional meaning of a word is necessary to capturing the full nuance of the metaphorical utterances in which it occurs.

Having established the importance of beginning with the best-attested conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία as a starting point for sketching the underlying model, I turn now to the specific lexical evidence for this word and its word group, which occurs primarily in legal documents and inscriptions. Scott identifies a series of terms commonly used interchangeably with υἱοθεσία that are part of the same semantic domain: εἰσποιεῖν, ἐκποιεῖν, τίθεσαι, ποιεῖσθαι, υἱοποιεῖσθαι, υἱοθετεῖν.[19] Words from this semantic domain are also noticeably absent from the LXX, which strongly suggests that their conventional meanings must be sought in other Greek and Roman sources.[20] Within Greco-Roman sources, υἱοθεσία and other members of its semantic domain are always used to denote adoptive sonship, and never used to express the sonship of a natural or biological son.[21] This is particularly clear in evidence from inscriptions where terms of adoption are used to record the adoptive parentage alongside the son's (or daughter's) natural father. For example, an inscription dating from the third century BCE from Rhodes reads:

'Απολλόδοτον Πολυκράτευς

---

[18] See also Michael J. Brown, "Paul's use of ΔΟΥΛΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΙΗΣΟΥ in Romans 1:1," *JBL* 120.4 (2001): 723-37.

[19] Scott, *Adoption as Sons,* 13.

[20] *Pace* Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 6-8.

[21] For examples of Greek epigraphical evidence of adoption see Mario Serge, *Iscrizioni di Cos* (Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 2007), no. 854; Peter Herrmann, *New Documents from Lydia* (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007), 31-32, 64; Marie-France Auzépy, "Campagne de prospection 2007 de la mission Marmara," *Anatolia Antiqua* 15 (2007): 342-43; Hasan Malay, and Marijana Ricl, "Some Funerary Inscriptions from Lydia," *EA* 39 (2006): 71 no. 45; Klaus Hallof, ed., *Inscriptiones Chii et Sami cum Corassiis Icarique* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003), no. 837, 838; for discussion of Latin epigraphical evidence see Christiane Kunst, *Römische Adoption: Zur Strategie einer Familienorganisation* (Frankfurter althistorische Beiträge 10, Hennef: Marthe Clauss, 2005), 253-57; Peppard, *The Son of God*, 50-70; see also Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 1-57.

καθ' ὑοθεσίαν δε Σωσιστράτου
Apollodotos, son of Polycrates,
son of Sosistratos according to adoption.[22]

Numerous examples such as the one above, which utilize similar adoption formulae, while also recording the natural parentage of the child, indicate unambiguously that these terms denote an adoptive relationship.[23] Moreover, of the possible terms available "υἱοθεσία seems to be one of the most common terms of adoption in Hellenistic Greek."[24] The majority of instances of υἱοθεσία occur in various inscriptions, in contrast to members of the εἰσποιεῖν word group that is much more prevalent in literary sources.[25] As Scott remarks, "there is a marked difference in the Hellenistic vocabulary of adoption between literary and non-literary sources," and non-literary sources comprise a substantial amount of the evidence for first-century adoption.[26]

The epigraphical evidence for adoption in Greek sources comes from a wide range of inscriptions discovered in multiple locations spanning several centuries, indicating that Greek and Roman practices of adoption were widespread and common, though the formulae used to convey adoption are by no means uniform.[27] Indeed, Christiane Kunst correctly notes that the epigraphic evidence for adoption presents numerous difficulties because "geht sie fast nie mit einem Wechsel des Namen oder der Filiation des Adoptierten einher."[28] Indeed, in many inscriptions words from the semantic domain of adoption do not appear at all, and adoption is indicated by the juxtaposition of two fathers, one of whom is designated "φύσει δὲ..."

---

[22] Erhard Grzybek, "Rhodische Inschriften," *ZPE* 165 (2008): 68-69.
[23] For a catalogue of such examples see Martin Smith, "Greek Adoptive Formulae," *Classical Quarterly* 17 (1967): 303-307.
[24] Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 55.
[25] The εἰσποιεῖν word group figures prominently Isaeus (2.10; 3:60; 6.22; 9.7; 10.9) and Demosthenes (e.g. 44.23, 26, 34). The verb in the active voice as a pejorative use, and in the middle voice as a neutral term of adoption, and the adjective (used most often as a substantive) and the noun also occur in both neutral and pejorative contexts. See also Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 14-24.
[26] Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 45.
[27] For discussions of Greek epigraphic evidence from a variety of dates and locations, see e.g. Sabine R. Huebner, "'Brother-Sister' Marriage in Roman Egypt: A Curiosity of Humankind or a Widespread Family Strategy," *JRS* 97 (2007): 27-40; Grzybek, "Rhodische Inschriften," 72-73; Pierre Debord, "Religion et Societé: Les Fêtes D'Hécate et de Zeus à Stratonicée de Carie," in *Espaces et Pouvoirs dans l'Antiquité de l'Anatolie à la Gaule*, ed. Julie Dalaison (Grenoble: CRHIPA, 2007), 239-50; Hallof, *Inscriptiones Chii et Sami,* no. 837, 838; Malay and Ricl, "Some Funerary Inscriptions from Lydia," 71.
[28] Kunst, *Römische Adoption*, 24.

indicating that the first father listed was the son's adoptive father.[29] For example, a funerary inscription from the Cayster Valley dated to the Roman Imperial Period reads:

> Νίκανδρε 'Αρτεμιδώ-
> ρου, φύσει δὲ Μηνο-
> γένου^{vacat}χαῖρε
> Nikandros, son of Artemidoros, by birth of Menogenes, farewell![30]

What is striking about the "φύσει δὲ…" gloss is that it demonstrates that adoption was prevalent enough for it to be unnecessary to designate the adoptive father using a clarifying term from the semantic domain of adoption. In addition, although adoptions are frequently recorded in the lineage of a son, Kunst makes the interesting observation that adoptions "haben kaum bildlichen Niederschlag gefunden, was erneut die Selbstverständlichkeit des Aktes,"[31] which perhaps further evidences the high level of social acceptance for kinship created through adoption. Moreover, Martin Smith identifies adoptive formulae involving ὑοθεσία or υἱοθεσία to be the most widespread and prevalent formulae in inscriptions, and further catalogues abbreviations of these adoptive formulae, which "in itself is an indication that people were familiar with the institution of adoption."[32] The majority of these inscriptions have been located in Rhodes, and the earliest are dated from before 200 B.C.E.. Later Rhodian inscriptions (from the first and second century B.C.E.) often utilize abbreviations for adoption, indicating, as Smith notes, that the practice was widespread.[33]

That υἱοθεσία is a term to designate the adoption of a son becomes even clearer when it is juxtaposed in a single context with terms denoting a natural son, which occurs several times in literary sources. Writing in the first century B.C.E., Diodorus describes both the birth and adoptive lineage of Scipio, who was "given in adoption (δοθεὶς δὲ εἰς υἱοθεσίαν)" as evidence of his high pedigree. In reference to both his birth and adoptive genealogies, Diodorus lauds Publius Scipio saying

---

[29] See e.g. Malay and Ricl, "Some Funerary Inscriptions from Lydia," 71; Herrmann, *New Documents from Lydia*, 31-32; for an interesting case recording the adoption of a daughter using the φύσει δὲ formula see N. Eda Akyürek Şahin, "Eine neue Ehrung für den Kaiser Domitian aus Bursa," in *Euergetes: Festschrift für Pro. Dr. Haluk Abbasoğlu zum 65 Geburtstag*, ed. İnci Delemen (Antalya: Suna-İnan Kiraç Akdeniz Medeniyetleri Araştirma Enstitüsü, 2008), 79-81.
[30] Malay and Ricl, "Some Funerary Inscriptions from Lydia," 71.
[31] Kunst, *Römische Adoption*, 23.
[32] Smith, "Greek Adoptive Formulae," 304.
[33] Ibid.

"Sprung from such stock, and succeeding to a family and clan of such importance, he showed himself worthy of the fame of his ancestors."[34] A parallel example using another form of adoptive formula is recorded by Isaeus, who says "the same law applies both when someone introduces a natural son (τινα φύσει γεγονότα) or an adopted son (ποιητόν)."[35] The contrast between a natural son and an adopted son clearly underscores the distinction between birth and adoption as means of creating kinship, and leave little room for doubt that the words from the semantic domain (εἰσποιεῖν, ἐκποιεῖν, τίθεσθαι, ποιεῖσθαι, υἱοποιεῖσθαι, υἱοθετεῖν) are used in reference to the act of adoption or to persons who have been adopted, and not to the general status of sonship.

Moreover, in addition to the many attestations of words from the semantic domain of adoption from inscriptions and other literary sources, Kunst has persuasively argued that the performance of adoption, and adoptive and quasi-adoptive relationships, were much more common than has been previously recognized.[36] She asserts that although the evidence from literary sources presents adoption as a clearly defined and straightforward legal procedure, a closer examination of both literary and epigraphical sources reveals both formal and informal instances of adoption that were modified to meet the individual requirements of families who needed to procure an offspring.[37] Due to the high degree of autonomy of the Roman household from legal regulation, Kunst argues, "Diese innerfamiliäre Unabhängigkeit – dieser quasi staatsfreie Raum – ermöglichte es, dass neben der Rechtsform der Adoption, die das gesamtgesellschaftliche Gleichgewicht zu erhalten hatte, eine soziale Adoptionsform existierte."[38] Similarly, Peppard remarks that the lexical evidence "for adoption in the Roman era reveals a highly adaptable social practice,"[39] and Suzanne Dixon remarks that the prevalent practice of adoption fits the Roman family's "readiness to extend relationships."[40] In light of the literary and epigraphical evidence there is little doubt that υἱοθεσία is a term used to designate the adoption of a son, but it is also important to recognize that, given the diversity of its

[34] Diodorus of Sicily, XXXI 26.4 (Walton, LCL).
[35] Isaeus, 7.15-16 (Forster, LCL).
[36] Kunst, *Römische Adoption*.
[37] Ibid., 291-99.
[38] Ibid., 194.
[39] Peppard, *The Son of God*, 54.
[40] Suzanne Dixon, *The Roman Family* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), 162.

use in the literary and epigraphical evidence, it does not necessarily denote a specific legal procedure.

For the purpose of establishing the conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία, the varied evidence from inscriptions and legal sources gives the impression that the practice of adoption was part of the social and cultural consciousness in the first century, which leads to the sure conclusion that υἱοθεσία was a term designating "adoption." Moreover, given the prevalence of the social practice it is certain that this conventional understanding would have been familiar to Paul's audience. Thus, having here established that the conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία drawn from the lexical evidence in literary sources and inscriptions undoubtedly denotes "adoption" rather than the more general "sonship," and having shown that the practice of adoption was relatively common by the first century C.E. in the Greco-Roman world, this evidence must now be weighed against contextual and intertextual considerations for the translation of υἱοθεσία in the Pauline texts. The following sections will evaluate the possible translations of υἱοθεσία in the context of Paul's letters, which possibly have been influenced not only by its attested social meaning but also by its relationship to precursory texts in the Old Testament and intertestamental literature.

2.2 Other Proposed Translations, Backgrounds, and Models

2.2.1 "Sonship" and Jewish Background

Despite acknowledging that υἱοθεσία in Greco-Roman sources denotes adoption, proponents of "sonship" as an appropriate translation of υἱοθεσία seek to translate the term in a way that gives due deference to Israel's designation as "son" in the Old Testament and other Jewish literature.[41] For example, in his desire to stress the continuity between the Old Testament and Paul, Byrne, in his monograph *"Sons of God" – "Seed of Abraham*,*"* has mounted a formidable defense of reading all of the Pauline occurrences of υἱοθεσία in light of an exclusively Jewish background and translating each Pauline occurrence "sonship" rather than "adoption." At the outset of his monograph, Byrne states "the present study has the…modest aim of taking a cue from Paul's own presentation and reading him in the light of his Jewish

[41] E.g. Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 1-8; Ronald Y. K. Fung, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (NICNT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 179; Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (WBC, Dallas: Word Books, 1990), 172.

background."[42] In his study, Byrne argues that υἱοθεσία in the Pauline corpus must denote "sonship" rather than "adoption" because adoption is not a Jewish practice, whereas the sonship of Israel was a well-worn image within Judaism.[43] An overarching area of Byrne's thesis that requires some revision, which I will undertake in more detail below, is that it does not address how metaphors relate to their underlying models. However, more immediately problematic are Byrne's methodological assumptions that intertextuality is a one-directional process where models and translations can feasibly be constructed "out of" precursory texts, and his neglect of the role the audience plays in a metaphor's interpretation. Because his study was published in 1979, it is understandable that Byrne does not engage in a methodological defense of his intertextual approach since intertextuality was in its nascent stages in biblical studies.[44] However, as I noted previously,[45] more recent studies on intertextuality have sharply questioned hermeneutical approaches such as the one Byrne adopts, and in light of the advances in intertextual methodologies, Byrne's thesis requires some revision before his proposed Jewish background material can be considered as part of the underlying model of υἱοθεσία.

To support his claim that υἱοθεσία is the Pauline equivalent to well-established expressions of sonship within Judaism, Byrne uses various texts from the Old Testament and Intertestamental literature to demonstrate that "sonship" is indeed a category already firmly established in Jewish thought. Thus, Byrne argues that in light of these texts υἱοθεσία must be translated "sonship" in its Pauline occurrences to reflect this Jewish background rather than the Greco-Roman practices of adoption. According to Byrne, Jewish sonship is an "expression of the bond between Yahweh and his people," and, "the unique privilege of Israel as the people chosen and created by Yahweh for himself."[46] In light of the numerous examples he gives of Israel's sonship, Byrne is adamant that Paul is not drawing upon the Greco-Roman concept of adoption as the basis for his examples in Romans and Galatians, but rather he is using

---

[42] Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 7.
[43] Ibid., 81.
[44] Richard Hays remarks, "Biblical critics are sometimes a little slow on the uptake with regard to such cultural fashions [such as intertextuality], but once we get wind of a new 'method' we are sure to pursue it relentlessly for all it is worth—and maybe then some" ("Forward to the English Edition," in *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, eds. Richard B. Hays, Stefan Alkier, Leroy A. Huizenga [Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009]), xi; Hays's own *Echoes of Scripture* was among the earliest publications that took seriously the theoretical dimensions of intertextuality.
[45] See section 3.1 of chapter 1.
[46] Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 16.

a well-established description of the relationship between Yahweh and his people supplied by his Jewish background.[47]

As I just noted, at its center, Byrne's attempt to construct a model and translation for the Pauline use of υἱοθεσία solely from a Jewish background is grounded in an intertextual argument, though he does not explicitly express it as such.[48] However, through the course of his argument it is plain that Byrne's case rests on the assumption that the Jewish texts he cites as background for the Pauline use of υἱοθεσία can be "added up" to equal its meaning in the Pauline text, without reference to its conventional meaning within the surrounding cultural context of Paul's audience. In his survey of Old Testament and intertestamental texts, Byrne includes a wide array of texts that describe Israel as "son," and although Byrne acknowledges that υἱοθεσία does not, in fact, appear in *any* of the examples he cites, he maintains that υἱοθεσία for Paul "expresses in a particularly apt way the status of Israel" that is seen in these texts.[49] As I will argue later, at least some of the texts Byrne cites as background are likely part of the underlying model for the υἱοθεσία metaphors, particularly in Romans 9:4.[50] However, by filtering out the Greco-Roman models of adoption and the conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία within Greco-Roman culture, Byrne's approach to intertextuality results in an idealized construction of a model and translation for υἱοθεσία which only contains the "consistent pattern of thought" taken from his selection of Jewish texts.

Problematically, Byrne's approach thus necessitates that first-century Judaism existed in a vacuum rather than in a porous relationship to the Hellenistic milieu in which it was situated. Moreover, Byrne's argument seems to make the *a priori* assumption that Paul could not have been borrowing a term from Greco-Roman culture, stating that studies relying on a Greek or Roman background for υἱοθεσία "fail to consider the possibility that Paul may not have had to search for a metaphor; that one may have been provided for him already by his Jewish background where

---

[47] Ibid., 216-20.
[48] Again, since Byrne's study was published in 1979, before most biblical scholars began writing on methods of intertextual inquiry, it is understandable that Byrne makes these methodological assumptions without much discussion or defense of them in his monograph. However, the texts he proposes as the background for the Pauline uses of υἱοθεσία (what I am terming "models") indeed provide a rich array of intertextual parallels, particularly in Romans 9:4, which is the locus of Byrne's exegesis. See section 3 of chapter 7 below for further discussion.
[49] Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 84; see also the discussion of Byrne's monograph in chapter 1 section 1.
[50] See section 3 of chapter 7 below.

Israel was seen as being in a relationship of sonship with respect to God."[51] While it is most certainly true that Paul was familiar with the sonship motif in the Old Testament and intertestamental literature, Walters points out, "Even if Paul sought to evoke Jewish expectations…he could not have removed himself from the Greco-Roman world."[52] However, if we recast Byrne's intertextual argument as a reciprocal and dialogical relationship between texts rather than a one-directional process where precursor texts are added up to construct the meaning of successors, and if we grant that Paul, though he was a first-century Jew, existed within the larger framework of the Greco-Roman world, we are left with a more workable framework through which to consider the Jewish background Byrne proposes.

While Byrne is certainly right to read Paul in light of a Jewish background, his hermeneutical approach to the sonship texts as a background for υἱοθεσία requires the following modifications. First, Byrne's Jewish background texts certainly might inform the underlying model of the υἱοθεσία metaphors, but they are also interanimated through the intertextual intersection of the Pauline texts.[53] The interanimated intertextual relationship between the Pauline texts and precursory sonship texts must also consider the possibility of rereading background texts retrospectively through the Pauline lens of "adoption." As I will show in my exegesis of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors, these interanimated intertextual relationships between precursory texts and the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors blend the categories of "Jewish sonship" and "Greco-Roman adoption" in the intertextual space.[54] Second, any analysis of metaphor must also account for the role of the audience as interpreters of the metaphor, which Byrne's analysis largely neglects. As I argued previously,[55] in using a metaphor an author extends an invitation to the audience to view the metaphor's tenor in light of its vehicle. By issuing this invitation, the author gives up control of spelling out exactly what features the vehicle of the metaphor highlights for the reader. Furthermore, because metaphors are indeterminate in their possible associations, and because intertextual relationships are likewise difficult to contain, it

[51] Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 81.
[52] Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," 42.
[53] See section 3.1 of chapter 1 for a methodological discussion on intertextuality.
[54] See section 3 of chapter 7.
[55] See esp. section 3 of chapter 3.

is unlikely that two audience members would produce precisely the same meaning for any given metaphor.

Because Byrne does not take into account the multivalent nature of intertextual relationships or the role Paul's audience played in the interpretation of the υἱοθεσία metaphors, his account of a Jewish background and his translation "sonship" are inadequate for the Pauline contexts. In light of the numerous attestations of υἱοθεσία surveyed above where it clearly means "adoption," and evidence which demonstrates that adoption was a well-known practice in the first century, Byrne's translation of "sonship" is on tenuous ground. In his attempt to demonstrate that Paul might have meant "sonship" rather than "adoption," he fails to consider that his case rests on all of the members of Paul's audience also understanding υἱοθεσία to mean "sonship" and not "adoption." As Stanley Stowers observes, "Texts belong to languages and therefore also derive their meanings from the social practices rather than, say, the intentions in the heads of authors."[56] Although Byrne does succeed in demonstrating that the sonship of Israel is a common motif in Jewish literature,[57] his appeal to these texts cannot purge υἱοθεσία of its conventional meaning "adoption" that is so widely attested in other extant first-century sources. It is highly unlikely that Paul's audience, upon hearing "υἱοθεσία," associated Israel's "sonship" model and also *did not* associate the model "adopted sonship," as Byrne's translation would require. It is far more plausible and satisfying to see the Pauline metaphors and Byrne's sonship texts in a dialectic and interanimated relationship, mutually reinforcing one another for the members of the audience. The Jewish understanding of Israel as "son" has been taken up and recast by Paul as adoptive sonship, which indicates that despite the clear presence of intertextual connections the most appropriate translation of υἱοθεσία in the Pauline contexts is still "adoption" or perhaps "adoption as sons."

However, it is important to note that Byrne's error does not lie in seeing the Jewish literature as background, but rather in allowing *only* these background texts to determine the translation "sonship." As I will show in the exegetical chapters, it is the combination of the interanimated background texts, Paul's distinctive contexts and usage of the υἱοθεσία metaphors, and the conventional definition of υἱοθεσία that

[56] Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans*, 6-7.
[57] Byrne's survey of sonship texts are not limited to the sonship of Israel, but include other categories such as "heavenly/angelic beings" and "royal sonship," (*"Sons of God,"* 9-78).

create metaphorical meaning. As I argued in the previous chapter, one of the chief functions of a metaphor is to shape and influence the perception of the audience. Thus it is perfectly possible that Paul's use of υἱοθεσία caused those in his audience familiar with the Jewish literature that Byrne cites to rethink the nature of the sonship described in those passages as specifically *adoptive* sonship, while at the same time recognizing that these texts likely informed Paul's choice to use υἱοθεσία as a metaphor.[58] This perspective emphasizes the dynamic and multivalent relationship between the Pauline metaphors and the Jewish texts. The Pauline metaphors have just as much potential for highlighting the adoptive aspect of Israel's sonship as the Jewish background of sonship did in aiding and influencing Paul's selection of an appropriate metaphor in the first place. Thus although below I will sketch the model from the Jewish background by considering texts from the Old Testament and intertestamental literature, when this model is juxtaposed with the Pauline metaphor in the exegetical chapters, I will also consider carefully whether the Pauline use "speaks back" in dialogue with these texts in the Jewish sonship tradition.

2.2.2 "Adoption" and a Jewish Background

Since the publication of Byrne's monograph there has been a steady trend to read the Pauline metaphors in light of a Jewish background, though a substantial number of scholars have rightly remarked that Byrne's translation of υἱοθεσία as "sonship" is problematic given the overwhelming evidence for "adoption" as the best translation for its conventional meaning. Of the recent studies published, Scott's monograph contains the most detailed and comprehensive analysis of the conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία in its first-century context. Scott concludes, "in the Hellenistic period υἱοθεσία always denotes 'adoption as son' and never merely, as commonly supposed, 'sonship.'"[59] Thus, unlike Byrne, Scott begins his exegesis of the Pauline texts using the best attested conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία, "adopted as son." Scott also recognizes that it is problematic that υἱοθεσία occurs nowhere in the LXX, though like Byrne, Scott desires to read Paul's use of υἱοθεσία in light of an exclusively Old Testament background. His solution to the absence of υἱοθεσία in the LXX is to argue for the concept of adoption being present even if the Greek word

[58] This notion will be more fully discussed in the analysis of Romans 9:4 in section 3 of chapter 7.
[59] Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, xiv.

group is absent. To make his case, Scott relies on what he terms a "Hebrew adoption formula," especially as it appears in 2 Samuel 7:14, which reads "I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me" (אֲנִי אֶהְיֶה־לּוֹ לְאָב וְהוּא יִהְיֶה־לִּי לְבֵן).[60] Scott argues strongly for seeing this "Hebrew adoption formula" and, more specifically, the adoption of the Davidic line in 2 Samuel 7:14, as the reference which underlies all of the Pauline occurrences of υἱοθεσία. He states,

> This understanding of υἱοθεσία against the background of the 2 Sam. 7:14 tradition provides the logical and necessary starting point for any further investigation of the sonship of believers in Paul; for "adoption" as a son of God provides the means of entry into divine sonship.[61]

Though Scott's monograph is very thorough in its examination of biblical and extra-biblical material in the 2 Samuel 7:14 tradition, his assertion that "the sure conclusion that υἱοθεσία…refers to a specific Old Testament Jewish background"[62] misunderstands the complexities of both intertextuality and the role models play in the production of metaphorical meaning.

In contrast to Byrne's monograph, by starting with "adoption" as the appropriate translation, Scott's approach does account for the Hellenistic background for the semantic field that includes υἱοθεσία and other related terms.[63] However, what is rather puzzling about Scott's argument is his insistence that the meaning of υἱοθεσία in the Pauline texts can be separated from the first-century practice of adoption that determines its conventional meaning, and that the background of its Pauline use can be restricted to a single Old Testament text. Since language is grounded in the social practices and shared activities of communities and societies,[64] it is unnatural and illogical for Scott to presuppose a background that does not include some of the key social practices and customs of the culture in which Paul's audience was situated. Furthermore, though Scott also attempts to find an intertextual link between the Pauline context and the Old Testament, he too does not adequately

---

[60] For similar arguments regarding Old Testament adoptions see Harald-Martin Wahl, "Ester, das adoptierte Waisenkind: Zur Adoption im Alten Testament," *Bib* 80.1 (1999): 78-99; see also Erhard Blum, "Psalm 2,7c—eine performative Aussage," in *Sefer Rendtorff: Festschrift zum 50sten Geburtstag von Rolf Rendtorff* (DBAT 1), ed. Konrad Rupprecht (Dielheim: Self-published by authors, 1975), 4-8.
[61] Ibid., 269.
[62] Ibid., 265.
[63] Scott remarks, "By the time of the New Testament, the semantic field of υἱοθεσία comprised at least six word groups" (*Adoption as Sons*, 13) and he examines all of the terms in order to avoid what Barr terms "the over-concentration on the single word" (*Semantics of Biblical Language*, 235).
[64] Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans*, 6.

address the complexities of intertextuality in his methodological approach, as intertextual links need to be treated both diachronically and synchronically.[65] Scott's argument, focused as it is on the one-directional, diachronic relationship between 2 Samuel 7:14 and the Pauline occurrences of υἱοθεσία, consequently mutes Paul's distinctive voice and vocabulary as a possible interpreter of the tradition Scott identifies.

Furthermore, Scott's argument fails to consider a metaphor's indeterminate nature or the role of the audience in his analysis. Even if the audience were to associate υἱοθεσία as a model with 2 Samuel 7:14, it is unlikely that this would be done to the exclusion of all other associations and implications of the model. For example, a gentile member of Paul's audience familiar with the first-century Roman practice of adoption might associate implications such as: adoption as establishing kinship apart from birth, adoption as a transfer from outside the family to inside the family, adoption guaranteeing inheritance, all of which are consistent with first-century Greek and Roman practices, but none of which are necessarily present in 2 Samuel 7:14.[66] Thus, in order for Scott's analysis to be plausible, Paul would somehow have had to ensure that his audience members considered only those implications derived from 2 Samuel 7:14. Since the evidence surveyed above shows that υἱοθεσία was a fairly widespread practice in the first century, it was also probably a fixed and indelible image in the minds of the audience, and this image is unlikely to have been entirely overshadowed by a single Old Testament text. Moreover, because there is no explicit reference or quotation of 2 Samuel 7:14 in any of the Pauline occurrences, it is unlikely that, as Scott maintains "by ignoring this methodological starting point, Pauline studies currently labors under some confusion about the subject of divine sonship."[67] On the contrary, perhaps all Scott is able to conclude from his study is that the adoption of the Davidic line in 2 Samuel 7:14 is present as *one* of the possible models of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors. Indeed, for some audience members it may not have been accessible at all.

---

[65] See section 3.1 of chapter 2 for a detailed discussion on metaphor and intertextuality; see also Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech*, 6.
[66] These implications will be discussed in sections 3.2 and 3.3 below.
[67] Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 270.

2.2.3 Summary: Model, Background, Intertextuality and the Role of the Audience

A few final remarks must be said here about the relationship between the underlying model and the role of the audience in the production of metaphorical meaning before examining specific models in the following section. Previous chapters have emphasized that metaphors are not wholly determinate in their meaning, and this is largely due to the role the audience plays in fleshing out the various implications of metaphorical meaning. Likewise, where more than one possible model exists it is impossible to rule out a particular model on the basis of supposed authorial intention since the author is but one part of the communicative act. Furthermore, given the possible backgrounds of υἱοθεσία and the cultural milieu of the recipients of Paul's letters, it is even feasible that elements from each model would have existed alongside one another within an individual. Therefore, no one background can be proposed to the exclusion of others. Moreover, within intertextual relationships, each act of interpretation can transform both precursor and successor texts for the interpreter, and thus we must also allow for the possibility of the backgrounds mutually informing and transforming one another for the audience members. Although the possible backgrounds will be treated separately below, they are by no means intended as exclusive alternatives. Rather, as "texts," broadly defined, the different backgrounds would likely have been interwoven to create a multivalent and complex underlying model for Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphors in the minds of his audience.

3. POSSIBLE MODELS FOR ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ

3.1 A Model from the Jewish Background

The presence of other Old Testament allusions and quotations in Romans and Galatians (e.g. references to Abraham [Rom 4:1-25; Gal 3:6-9, 16-18], to Sarah [Rom 4:19; 9:9; Gal 4:21-31], and Hagar [Gal 4:21-31], the giving of the Law [Rom 9:4; Gal 3:17-21], etc.) suggests that Paul assumed that his audience was at least familiar with a Jewish framework, that he himself was likely operating under a Jewish framework (though not exclusively so), and moreover the possibility exists that there were some Jewish believers present in his audience. Therefore, it is likely that at least some of the audience members would have recalled and drawn upon the Jewish tradition of sonship for their "consistent imaginative construct" underlying the υἱοθεσία metaphors in the Pauline texts. The Old Testament designation of Israel as

the son of YHWH is perhaps most salient in Romans 9:4, which lists υἱοθεσία among the privileges of Israel, and thus this occurrence especially demands careful attention to the intertextual relationships between the Pauline text and other texts in the Jewish sonship tradition.[68] However, it also must be emphasized at the outset that the Jewish background cannot be neatly separated from the Greek and Roman backgrounds, nor can υἱοθεσία be emptied of its conventional meaning as a term for adoption. Rather, the Jewish tradition of the sonship of Israel and the Israelites both informs the metaphor and is itself informed by the Greek and Roman adoption practices.

As I have shown above, the Jewish texts which may underlie the υἱοθεσία metaphors in the Pauline texts constitute the least straightforward of the possible models, and furthermore they require consideration of the intertextual relationships between the Pauline texts and precursory texts. This is especially true given that the conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία denotes "adoption," and that Hebrew lacks a functional equivalent to υἱοθεσία.[69] Moreover, because each occurrence of the Pauline metaphor evokes different intertextual relationships I will restrict the preliminary discussion below to a brief and succinct mention of several of the most relevant texts in order to provide a rough "sketch" of the Jewish model underlying the υἱοθεσία metaphors in the Pauline texts.

It is striking that by the first century Greek and Roman adoption practices were sufficiently well known by Jewish writers that they began to use the semantic field of υἱοθεσία to describe Moses's situation with Pharaoh's daughter in Exodus 2:10. For example, Philo writes τελειότερον δὲ τῆς ἡλικίας ἰδοῦσα κἀκ τῆς ὄψεως ἔτι μᾶλλον ἢ πρότερον σπάσασα εὐνοίας *υἱὸν ποιεῖται* τὰ περὶ τοὐ ὄγκον τῆς γαστρὸς τεχνάσασα πρότερον, ἵνα γνήσιος ἀλλὰ μὴ ὑποΒολιμαῖος νομισθῇ (*Mos.* 1.19).[70] Similarly, Josephus writes, Ὄντα δ' αὐτὸν τοιοῦτον ἡ Θέρμουθις *παῖδα ποιεῖται*,[71] indicating that he also found terms from the semantic domain of adoption

[68] These texts and the intertextual connections will be treated thoroughly in section 3 of chapter 7 on Romans 9:4.

[69] Scott recognizes this too, but states that "it is necessary to distinguish between the meaning of a term and its background in any particular context. Since, in the final analysis, the context indicates what kind of adoption is in view, Paul's concept of adoption could be based on an Old Testament/Jewish background" (*Adoption as Sons*, 61).

[70] And the princess, seeing him so advanced beyond his age, conceived for him an even greater fondness than before, and took [adopted] him for her son, having at an earlier time artificially enlarged the figure of her womb to make him pass as her real and not a supposititious child" (LCL, trans. F. H. Colson).

[71] "Such was the child whom Thermuthis adopted as her son" (LCL, trans. Henry St. John Thackeray).

to be an appropriate label for Moses's situation in Exodus (*Ant*. 2.232). In addition, the Greek translation of *Jubilees* labels Moses's case an adoption, καὶ Φαρίῃ, βασιλίδι οὔσῃ *εἰσποιηθείς* (*Jub.* 47:5). Josephus also designates Lot as Abram's adopted son, using the phrase Ἄβραμος δὲ Λῶτον τὸν Ἀράνου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ υἱὸν τῆς δὲ γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ Σάρρας ἀδελφὸν εἰσεποιήσατο γνησίου παιδὸς ἀπορῶν (*Ant.* 1.154).[72] These examples suggest that the use of the Greek adoption terminology to denote artificially established kinship between human parents and children might have been fairly prevalent within first-century Judaism.

However, it is anachronistic to claim, as Scott does, that these examples demonstrate a Jewish concept of adoption in the original texts. Exodus 2:10 reads וַיִּגְדַּל הַיֶּלֶד וַתְּבִאֵהוּ לְבַת־פַּרְעֹה וַיְהִי־לָהּ לְבֵן, which is best translated "when the child grew up she brought him to Pharaoh's daughter and he became a son to her." Though something like an adoptive relationship might be implied in the text, it is very difficult to assert that the earliest readers of Exodus 2:10 would have labeled it as such, given that the Old Testament law lacks evidence for the institution of legal adoption, and that it maintains a consistent emphasis on the perpetuation of patrilineal descent in the case of orphans and widows (e.g. Gen 38:8; Deut 25:5-6, 9-10; Ruth 4:17). Rather, we see in Josephus and Philo a similar situation to the Pauline uses of υἱοθεσία. Namely, Paul, Philo, and Josephus have all appropriated Hellenistic terms and used them to describe earlier Jewish texts. Thus, in these examples Hellenistic and Hebraic influences cannot be neatly separated.

Given that several first-century Jewish authors felt free to utilize the semantic domain of adoption to describe the relationships between humans in Old Testament texts, the pertinent question for the purpose of exegeting the Pauline metaphors is how υἱοθεσία connects to the Old Testament texts where Israel or the Davidide are named the son of YHWH. Although it is unlikely that the first readers or authors of the Old Testament would have seen Israel's sonship or the Davidide's sonship as adoptive sonship specifically, the texts cited above suggest that it is more probable first-century readers might have interpreted these textual tradition in light of adoption. For example, there are numerous metaphorical references to the sonship of Israel in the Old Testament, and presumably it is this tradition that Paul labels υἱοθεσία in

[72] Now Abraham, having no legitimate son, adopted Lot, his brother Aran's son and the brother of his wife Sarra" (LCL, trans. Thackeray).

Romans 9:4.[73] If we take a synchronic approach to the construction of the underlying model, then it is perfectly plausible to suggest that the first-century "text" of the cultural practice of υἱοθεσία speaks to the Old Testament texts that identify Israel as YHWH's son, forming a new tradition of Israel as the adopted son of YHWH for the Pauline audience that was familiar with these precursory texts.

Taking into account the synchronic nature of intertextuality, some of the relevant texts for constructing the model for υἱοθεσία in its Pauline occurrences might include texts such as Exod 4:22; 2 Samuel 7:14; Psalm 2:7; Deuteronomy 8:5; Deuteronomy 14:1; Proverbs 3:11-12; Isaiah 43:6-7; Jeremiah 31:9; Hosea 2:1 [MT]; and Malachi 1:6.[74] The sonship in 2 Samuel 7:14 (אֲנִי אֶהְיֶה־לּוֹ לְאָב וְהוּא יִהְיֶה־לִּי לְבֵן)[75] and Psalm 2:7 (אֲסַפְּרָה אֶל־חֹק יְהוָה אָמַר אֵלַי בְּנִי אַתָּה אֲנִי הַיּוֹם יְלִדְתִּיךָ)[76] is extended not to Israel as a collective, but to the successor of the Davidic monarchy specifically. However, Scott suggests that the Davidide's sonship is "subsumed under the covenant with Israel."[77] Scott continues, "[I]f the עם of Yahweh are the בנים of God, then the reciprocal covenant relationship between Yahweh as the God of Israel and Israel as the עם of Yahweh embraces the reciprocal relationship between Yahweh as the Father of the Davidide and the Davidide as the בן of God."[78] Israel's collective sonship is in view in Exodus 4:22 (כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה בְּנִי בְכֹרִי יִשְׂרָאֵל),[79] and YHWH compares his discipline of Israel to that of a father and son in Deuteronomy 8:5 (וְיָדַעְתָּ עִם־לְבָבֶךָ כִּי כַּאֲשֶׁר יְיַסֵּר אִישׁ אֶת־בְּנוֹ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מְיַסְּרֶךָּ)[80] and in Proverbs 3:11-12 (מוּסַר יְהוָה בְּנִי אַל־תִּמְאָס וְאַל־תָּקֹץ בְּתוֹכַחְתּוֹ׃ כִּי אֵת אֲשֶׁר יֶאֱהַב יְהוָה יוֹכִיחַ וּכְאָב אֶת־בֵּן יִרְצֶה).[81] Malachi 1:6 (see also Mal 3:17) does not specifically reference Israel as "son," but it is implicit in the comparison made in the text (בֵּן יְכַבֵּד אָב וְעֶבֶד אֲדֹנָיו וְאִם־אָב אֲנִי אַיֵּה כְבוֹדִי).[82]

---

[73] Much more will be said about Israelite sonship and Romans 9:4 in section 3 of chapter 7.
[74] Trevor Burke adds Deut 1:31 and Hos 11 in his list of paradigmatic sonship texts, however the imagery in these passages is of a mother and son, and thus is not a direct parallel of the Father-son relationship Paul invokes in Romans and Galatians (*The Message of Sonship: At Home in God's Household* [Downers Grove: IVP, 2011], 53-68; 81-99).
[75] "I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me."
[76] "You are my son; today I have begotten you."
[77] Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 99.
[78] Ibid.
[79] "Thus says the LORD, 'Israel is my firstborn son.'"
[80] "Know then in your heart that as a father disciplines his son, so the LORD your God disciplines you."
[81] My son do not despise the LORD's discipline or be weary of his reproof, for the Lord reproves the one he loves, as the father the son in whom he delights."
[82] "A son honors his father, and servants their master. If I am a father, where is the honor due me?"

Often the collective sonship of Israel is found in passages that contain a rebuke because they have forgotten YHWH as their Father and Creator (Isa 43:6-7; Mal 2:10). This rebuke is most prominently seen in Deuteronomy 32:5-6, which reads

שִׁחֵת לוֹ לֹא בָּנָיו מוּמָם דּוֹר עִקֵּשׁ
עַם נָבָל וְלֹא חָכָם הֲלוֹא־הוּא אָבִיךָ קָנָךְ הוּא עָשְׂךָ וַיְכֹנְנֶךָ׃
הֲ־לַיהוָה תִּגְמְלוּ־זֹאת עַם נָבָל וְלֹא חָכָם הֲלוֹא־הוּא אָבִיךָ קָנָךְ הוּא עָשְׂךָ וַיְכֹנְנֶךָ[83]

In addition, several Old Testament texts closely link Israel's sonship with their salvation from YHWH their father (e.g. Isa 63:16; Jer 31:9). Though this list of texts is by no means exhaustive, the diversity of the list demonstrates that sonship is one of the Old Testament descriptions of Israel's covenant relationship with YHWH, and much more will be said about the relationship between YHWH's covenant with Israel and the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors in the exegetical chapters. As Byrne remarks, in the context of the covenant with Israel sonship adds "a special element of intimacy" and "a demand for acknowledgement."[84]

The Jewish sonship tradition also appears in various forms and with various emphases in the intertestamental literature (e.g. Wis 12:19-22; 18:1-4; Sirach 36:16-17; Jdt 9:12-14; *Jos. Asen.* 19.8; 3 Macc 6.27-28; 7.6; *Pss. Sol.* 17.26-29). As in the Old Testament texts mentioned above, the sonship references in the intertestamental literature retain a degree of fluidity between designating the collective of Israel as "son" and also naming individuals among the Israelites "sons of God." For example, Sirach 51:10 contains a passage that is remarkably similar to Romans 8:15 and Galatians 4:6 where an individual is "crying out" to God the Father. Sirach 51:10 reads "I cried out, 'Lord, you are my Father; do not forsake me in the days of trouble (ἐπεκαλεσάμην κύριον πατέρα κυρίου μου μή με ἐγκαταλιπεῖν ἐν ἡμέραις θλίθεως)." However in Sirach 36:16 Israel as a whole is designated the "firstborn (πρωτότοκος)" of the Lord.

Moreover, Sirach 36:16 also highlights the fact that the precursory texts do not always rely on precisely the same underlying "sonship" model; some texts use the more general terms "son" or "sons," and some use the more specific "firstborn" (e.g. Wis 18:13; Sir 36:16; *Ps.Sol.* 18.4; *Jub.* 19:29). Despite the differences in

---

[83] "Yet his degenerate sons have dealt falsely with him, a perverse and crooked generation. Do you thus repay the Lord, O foolish and senseless people? Is not he your father, who created you, who made you and established you?"
[84] Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 16.

terminology, this need not mean that these texts should be excluded from consideration. Rather, in sketching the model for the Pauline texts the two designations υἱοθεσία and πρωτότοκος must sit alongside one another, and Paul's unique use of υἱοθεσία must be allowed to speak back to the texts in the "firstborn son" tradition. While it is clear that the intertestamental literature continues the Old Testament sonship traditions, it must be emphatically stated that the Jewish background cannot be considered in isolation from the conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία in its first-century cultural context, nor can one view this tradition as background for the Pauline use of υἱοθεσία without also considering Paul's interpretation of it. Rather, both the Jewish "sonship" and "firstborn son" models must sit alongside the "adoption" models from the Greco-Roman sources, each speaking its own voice to Paul's reader.

3.2. Greek Background

Above I discussed the lexical evidence for words in the same semantic domain as υἱοθεσία, and the evidence discussed was drawn from both Greek and Roman legal sources detailing specific practices of adoption and epigraphical evidence which attested to the adopted status of various individuals. The purpose above was to determine the appropriate translation and conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία, and here the task is to examine several of the pertinent underlying cultural assumptions that are latent in the evidence for Greek and Roman adoption practices in order to provide a fuller sketch of the Greek and Roman models of adoption. Unlike Jewish culture, Greek culture did have a formal institution of adoption. Early evidence for Greek adoption, largely found in sources dated prior to the fourth century B.C.E., demonstrates that "adoption was widely recognized as a legitimate means of refiguring kinship structures."[85] Although some have argued that Greek practices of adoption were in decline by as early as the fourth century B.C.E.,[86] recent interpretations of the epigraphical evidence from Hellenistic Athens have suggested a higher degree of continuity between adoption practices in Hellenistic and Roman Athens. For example, Lene Rubinstein et al. argue, "[I]t is not reasonable to assume that the Athenian institution of adoption had disappeared at some stage between the

[85] Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 29.
[86] Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons*, 89.

end of the fourth century and the mid-second century B.C. (the period for which we have no sources!) only to reappear in a Roman guise at this point."[87] The literary evidence for Greek adoption shows that it was used primarily for a father to secure an heir to manage the destiny of his οἶκος, and inheritance is a prominent theme in the speeches of Isaeus and Demosthenes. Although few sure conclusions can be drawn from the epigraphical evidence from the second century B.C.E., "there is no apparent reason to believe that it [adoption] had changed drastically from the institution which is described in the forensic speeches of the Attic orators."[88] Significantly, the texts that describe Greek adoption share common themes, such as lineage and inheritance, with the Pauline metaphors. These common affinities likely point to the presence of shared values that underlie both Greek and Roman practices of adoption, and continued through the first century when Paul penned his metaphor.

The evidence in legal sources is sufficiently scant and varied that it is unwise to speak of a univocal concept of "Greek adoption," but rather evidence for various practices of Greek adoption.[89] Our source of knowledge regarding the Greek legal practice of adoption comes almost entirely from the orations of Isaeus and Demosthenes. Though the legal evidence for the specific practices and procedures for Greek adoptions is lacking, the speeches of Isaeus and Demosthenes provide us with an interesting perspective on the social and cultural norms regarding adopted fathers and sons. However, it should be noted that Isaeus and Demosthenes preserve cases where adoption is being disputed. Their usefulness is therefore not that they demonstrate the legal customs of adoption, but rather lies in examining what norms and values they appeal to in the course of their arguments regarding the disputed adoptions. In their writings it becomes clear that the primary function of Greek adoption was to provide an heir to take over the estate, to pass along an inheritance, and to secure care for an adoptive father in his old age. [90]

There were three types of adoption recorded in Greek sources: testamentary adoption, posthumous adoption, and adoption *inter vivos*. Testamentary adoptions and posthumous adoptions occur most frequently, whereby a father named and adopted a

---

[87] Lene Rubinstein (et al.), "Adoption in Hellenistic and Roman Athens," *Classica et Mediaevalia* 42 (1991): 142.
[88] Ibid.
[89] Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 29.
[90] Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 4; see also Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons*, 90-91.

son in his will (testamentary adoption) or left the selection of a son to his family upon his death (posthumous adoption).[91] Though there are more cases of testamentary and posthumous adoptions in the relevant Athenian sources, this is likely because adoption *inter vivos* was much harder to contest. In cases of *inter vivos* adoption, the adopted son had the same legal rights as a natural son, and entered the family while his adoptive father was still living (Isaeus 6.63). According to Isaeus, a son was adopted *inter vivos* by presenting him for public enrollment in a deme or phratry, which was a way for both natural and adoptive fathers to secure citizenship and inheritance rights for such sons (εἴ τις αὐτὸς ζῶν καὶ εὖ φρονῶν ἐποιήσατο καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερὰ ἀγαγὼν εἰς τοὺς συγγενεῖς ἀπέδειξε καὶ εἰς τὰ κοινὰ γραμματεῖα ἐνέγραψεν [Isaeus 7.1]).[92] Walters notes, "Because a son adopted *inter vivos* retained his right to a share of the father's inheritance even if the father produced natural heirs following the adoption, this form of adoption was probably unpopular with men until they were advanced in years."[93]

Greek law seems to have had several stipulations on adoption, including that the adoptive father must be in possession of his mental faculties, not under the influence of drugs or disease, free from the influence of a woman, and not under constraint or deprived of liberty (ἂν μὴ μανιῶν ἢ γήρως ἢ φαρμάκων ἢ νόσου ἕνεκα, ἢ γυναικὶ πειθόμενος, ὑπὸ τούτων του παρανοῶν, ἢ ὑπ' ἀνάγκης ἢ ὑπὸ δεσμοῦ καταληφθείς [Dem. 46:14]). The most pertinent difference from Roman conventions includes the stipulation in Greek law that a father could not adopt if he already had a legal heir. Such a stipulation shows how closely the concepts of adoption and inheritance were linked in Greek social norms. This law, cited by Demosthenes reads,

> Any citizen…shall have the right to dispose of his own property by will as he shall see fit, if he have no male children lawfully born (ἂν μὴ παῖδες ὦσι γνήσιοι ἄρρενες).[94]

There are several other distinctive features of Greek adoption that are not found in its Roman counterpart. Interestingly, the cases reported by Isaeus and Demosthenes suggests that Greek adoption did not require the severing of all original familial ties,

---

[91] Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," 47; for a full analysis of the Greek sources, see Lene Rubinstein, *Adoption in IV. Century Athens* (Opuscula Graecolatina 34, Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 1993, 117-25).
[92] "after he [the living adopter] has led his adopted son to the domestic shrines and presented him to his kindred and inscribed him in the official registers" (trans. Forster, LCL).
[93] Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," 47.
[94] Demosthenes, *Private Orations, XLI-XLIX*, 46.14 (trans. Murray, LCL).

which is further confirmed by later epigraphical evidence of epitaphs, private dedications, and various lists of priests and archons that preserve the patronymics of both the adoptive and natural father of a son.[95] Most notably, in Greek adoption an adopted son retained his connection to his natural mother (Isaeus, 7.25).[96] Furthermore, A. R. W. Harrison states that "An adoptee had the right to return to the house of his natural father if he left a son of his body in the house of his adoptive father," citing Isaeus 6.44 (ὁ γὰρ νόμος οὐκ ἐᾷ ἐπανιέναι, ἐὰν μὴ ὑὸν καταλίπῃ γνήσιον).[97] There also was some distinction within Greek practices between the adopted and natural children in terms of the future of the οἶκος.[98] A. R. W. Harrison remarks,

> A man who had himself been adopted might in certain cases be thereby disqualified from adopting a son…This rule might seem strange to us, but possibly it was felt that such an adoptee's rights to enter without ἐπιδικασία was based on the assumption that he would produce for the οἶκος heirs of his body and that if he did not do so the ἀγχιστεῖς should recover their rights.[99]

These features of Greek adoption further emphasize the close connection between adoption and inheritance in Greek culture, but I will show in the exegetical chapters that it is difficult to reconcile some of the specific practices of Greek adoption with the flow of Paul's argument in Galatians and Romans.[100] However, given that there are always parts of an underlying model that do not figure in the formation of metaphorical meaning, it should not trouble us that there are aspects of the Greek practices that do not seem to fit with Paul's examples. On the contrary, it is enough to conclude that since both the examples from Isaeus and Demosthenes and the Pauline texts connect adoption with inheritance that they likely are drawing on a shared and common cultural belief that one of the purposes of adoption was to secure an heir.

---

[95] See, e.g. *IG II*^{2} 7691; 2992; 1717; see also Rubinstein, "Adoption in Hellenistic and Roman Athens," 149-51 for a helpful chart of the epigraphical evidence.
[96] For a full discussion of the specific legal provisions governing Athenian adoption see A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens: The Family and Property* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 82-96.
[97] Ibid., 94.
[98] See Rubinstein, "Adoption in Hellenistic and Roman Athens," 146-51; Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons*, 93.
[99] Harrison, *The Law of Athens*, 85-86.
[100] See especially the discussions in sections 2.3 of chapter 5 and 2.2 of chapter 6.

3.3 Roman Background

Because the literary evidence and epigraphical evidence does not present a clear-cut picture of "Greek adoption" and "Roman adoption" it is difficult to delineate precise boundaries around "Greek practices" and "Roman practices." However, the Roman legal sources describe a slightly different set of cultural values, and the epigraphical evidence indicates that adoptions were a fairly common occurrence in the Roman period. In light of this evidence, I contend that there is a high probability that Paul's audience was familiar with the conventions of Roman adoption. Moreover, there is considerable continuity between the earliest Roman legal sources and later sources such as the law codes of Gaius and Justinian, suggesting that the ideology driving the legal practice of adoption remained more or less constant over the course of several centuries. However, some of the examples below will also show that in some cases there are large discrepancies between the descriptions of adoption in legal documents and the practice as it was carried out throughout the empire. All of these factors must be weighed in order to best understand the features of Roman adoption that Paul's audience would most likely have associated with the uses of υἱοθεσία metaphors in his letters.

Adoption in Roman society served similar purposes to Greek adoption, chief among them being securing a suitable heir for an estate. According to Peppard, "adoption was a crucial technique for sustaining the peculiarly Roman perspective on fathers and sons, in which every Roman was under the *patria potestas* or 'paternal power' of the eldest male in the family."[101] It is difficult for contemporary Western readers to comprehend some of the peculiarities of the Roman *familia*, and none is more foreign to contemporary sensibilities than the power of the *paterfamilias*. The *paterfamilias* of a Roman *familia* had "the power of life and death (*utique ei uitae necisque in eum potestas* [Gellius, *Attic Nights*, 5.19.9])" over his estate, which included his wife, children, and slaves, though this power was usually used to exert authority over the management of the household rather than to exercise his paternal authority over more extreme situations, such as the exposure of infants.[102] Under Roman law a *paterfamilias* had the right to arrange and approve the marriages of his

[101] Peppard, *The Son of God*, 50.
[102] See Ibid., 50-51; Emiel Eyben, "Fathers and Sons," in *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome*, ed. Beryl Rawson (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 106-43; Richard Saller, "*Patria Potestas* and the Stereotype of the Roman Family," *Continuity and Change* 1 (1986): 7-22.

children, sell his sons (though not his daughters) or bind them to a creditor, adopt his sons into another family, and expose his infant children.[103] He retained this power until his death, so even his grown sons were *in potestate* until the death of their father. In theory a Roman father held absolute authority over his family (Gaius, *Inst.* 1.55), but in practice the primary responsibility of the *paterfamilias* was the management of the estate's goods. This role required the *paterfamilias* to ensure the preservation of the family's wealth, status, honor, and cult. Adoption provided the *paterfamilias* with an avenue to preserve the family's inheritable goods through the exercise of his *potestas* to make a son for himself by decree.[104] Peppard notes that adoption

> was not enacted to stabilize the life of a child, but to stabilize the future of a father….Roman adoption, as with most other Roman family relations, was unusually focused on the *paterfamilias*. At issue were his name, his wealth, his status, and his sacred rites; without a son, his divine spirit (*genius*) would perish. One could say that all laws led to the Roman father.[105]

Therefore, because of the Roman "readiness to extend relationships,"[106] adoption was often the most expedient means by which a *paterfamilias* (usually childless) could ensure the preservation of the inheritable goods of his *familia.* Thus it is unsurprising to find that discussions regarding inheritance and the transmission of power figure prominently in the Roman legal sources pertaining to adoption.

Because the estate rested on the *potestas* of the *paterfamilias*, the primary purpose of Roman adoption was for the *paterfamilias* to be able to pass on his *potestas* to a suitable heir upon his death.[107] In order to adopt under Roman law, one had to possess *potestas* and be legally independent (*sui iuris*). A natural consequence of adoption being the right of the *paterfamilias* is that Roman women could not adopt because they could not possess *potestas*. Neither did the wife of the adoptive *paterfamilias* enter into the relationship of "mother" to an adopted son. Justinian records that, "if I adopt a son, my wife does not occupy the place of a mother to him"

---

[103] Dixon, *The Roman Family*, 40.
[104] Peppard remarks of Roman testamentary adoptions, "one can behold in them the potency of the Roman *paterfamilias*: he could sire children even from beyond the grave" (*The Son of God*, 59).
[105] Ibid., 60.
[106] Dixon*, The Roman Family*, 162.
[107] Marek Kurylowicz, *Die Adoptio im klassichen römischen Recht* (Studia Antiqua, Warsaw: University of Warszawskeigo, 1981), 50; there are also numerous secondary motives for both giving and receiving sons in Roman adoption including: political maneuvering, alleviating the financial burden of a natural family raising a child, releasing a child from the overwhelming debt of an estate, etc.

(*Dig.* 1.7.23).[108] However, adoption did enact any agnatic relationships that are a natural extension of the father-son relationship, thus the adoptee became the legal brother (or sister in rare cases) to any other children of the *paterfamilias* (*Dig*. 1.7.23). Furthermore, adoption was meant to "imitate nature"[109] and therefore it was clearly expected that the adopted son was to be younger than his adoptive *paterfamilias*.[110] Justinian records the conventional age gap between the adoptive *paterfamilias* and the adoptee as eighteen years, or "a full term of puberty" (*Inst. Iust.* 1.11.4).[111] A further consequence of adoption imitating nature is that an adoptive son was not able to renounce his adoption or the *potestas* of his adoptive *paterfamilias*, and remained *in potestate* until the death of the *paterfamilias* just like a natural son (Gellius*, Attic Nights*, 5.19).[112]

There were two major types of adoption under Roman law: *adrogatio* and *adoptio*.[113] These two types differed in that an *adrogatio* adoption involved the adoption of a son who was already *sui iuris,* whereas an *adoptio* involved the adoption of a son who was under the *potestas* of another *paterfamilias*.[114] The procedure governing *adrogatio* adoptions were much more cumbersome than the procedure for *adoptio*, and Walters notes that "*Adrogations* were probably never very common."[115] Because *adrogatio* involved the adoption of one *paterfamilias* by another, it meant that the adoptee surrendered his *potestas* over his inheritable goods (wealth, family, honor, and cult) and came under the *potestas* of his adopted *paterfamilias*. Moreover, Gellius records that especially in cases of *adrogatio* adoption the court must also consider whether the adopter is suited to having natural children and whether the property and wealth of the adoptee is being sought under false pretenses (*Attic Nights* 5.19.5-6). Scott remarks, "*adrogatio* actually extinguished one *familia* to perpetuate another."[116] Because *adrogatio* meant the dissolution of a *familia* along with its *sacra*, the procedure required an enquiry by the

---

[108] "*et ideo si filium adoptavero, uxor mea illi matris loco non est*."
[109] "*adoptio enim naturam imitator*" (*Inst. Iust.* 1.11.4).
[110] A notable exception was Clodius, who adopted a plebian *older* than he, which shows that the aristocrats did not always abide by the rules they enacted (Cicero, *Dom.* 34-38).
[111] "*debet itaque is qui sibi per adrogationem vel adoptionem filium facit, plena pubertate, id est decem et octo annis praecedere*."
[112] "*utique ei vitae necisque in eum potestas siet, uti patri endo filio est*."
[113] Though the formal legal code distinguishes between these two types of adoption, the terminology for adoption in other sources is much less precise and *ad hoc*; see also Kunst, *Römische Adoption*, 14.
[114] Kunst, *Römische Adoption*, 86.
[115] Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," 53.
[116] Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 10.

college of pontiffs and the approval of the adoption by formal vote of a *comitia curiata* in Rome.[117]

In contrast, *adoptio* was a private transaction between the natural *paterfamilias* and the adoptive *paterfamilias* of a son who was *homo alieni iuris.* The procedure for *adoptio* involved the natural *paterfamilias* selling his son into slavery to another party three times, and having the other party manumit the son after each time he was sold. Roman law returned sons to the authority of the *paterfamilias* the first two times they were manumitted, but after the third sale the father's *potestas* over his son was broken.[118] Once the natural father's *potestas* was broken, the adoptee came under the *potestas* of the adoptive *paterfamilias* by the decree of the magistrate. Scott remarks, "*adoptio sensu stricto* was a secular and relatively private matter involving only one individual as the object of adoption"[119] and therefore in contrast to *adrogatio*, "*adoptio* could take place anywhere a magistrate was available."[120]

What the two forms of Roman adoption as described in legal sources share in common is the removal of a son from one family and his permanent placement under the authority of a new *paterfamilias*. Although adoption could be a means of upward social mobility, Kunst notes, "Vermutlich war der soziale Kreis, der hier Söhne tauschte ohnehin vergleichsweise homogen."[121] However, despite that adoption usually involved a relatively lateral social move, adoption did have several substantial benefits for the adopted son, including the cancellation of any outstanding debts and acquiring the status of his new *familia*. Furthermore, within the Roman *familia* there was no distinction in status between natural sons and adoptive sons.[122] Gaius records, "Adoptive sons in their adoptive family are in the same legal position as real sons" (*Inst.* 2.136),[123] and also "as long as they remain in the adoptive *familia*, they are considered strangers so far as their natural father is concerned (*Inst.* 2.137)."[124] Hodge remarks that the Romans considered adoption "a practical means of maintaining

---

[117] Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," 53.
[118] The Twelve Tables records "*si pater ter filium venum duit, filius a patre liber esto* (if father thrice surrender his son for sale, son shall be free from father) [4.2. LCL]."
[119] Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 12.
[120] Ibid.
[121] Kunst, *Römische Adoption*, 294.
[122] Note also that there was no legal provision restricting adopted sons from adopting their heirs in Roman law as there was in Greek law.
[123] "*Adoptiui filii, quamdiu manent in adoptione, naturalium loco sunt.*"
[124] "*Qua ratione accidit, ut ex diuerso, quod ad naturalem parentem pertinet, quamdiu quidem sint in adoptiua familia, extraneorum numero habeantur*."

lineages; it provided a ritually created, socially accepted stand-in for a blood relative."[125] At its heart, the institution of Roman adoption was a calculating way for the *paterfamilias* to ensure the preservation of his *gens* and for an adoptee to advance his wealth and status; it left little room for sentimentality. Seneca advises young men who have been requested for adoption to be prudent about agreeing to the arrangement, stating, "If [this young man] wants to go, he should inquire how many ancestors the old man who seeks him has, what rank they are, what the old man's wealth is" (1.6.6)."[126] While Roman practices may lack the sentimentality of the contemporary concept of adoption, nevertheless they were a powerful means of restructuring identity, status, and wealth, and they afforded Roman fathers and sons a "remedy for chance"[127] to alter the natural course of both individual and familial destinies.

However, the Roman legal practices of adoption do not necessarily reflect the complex social realities that surrounded the Roman institution. Rather, as Kunst argues, "Das Festhalten am Rechtsmodell diente dann auch vornehmlich dazu, die Gesellschaft in ihrer Idealform zu reproduzieren."[128] Indeed, the extant papyri and epigraphical evidence "demonstrate the diversity of terminology and ideas involved."[129] Thus, the legal sources often do not exactly align with other documentary evidence where instances of "common law" adoptions are recorded. These "common law" adoptions often flouted the legal regulations set down by the law codes,[130] but these adoptions "not legally made" could be later confirmed by the emperor (*Dig.* 1.7.38).

Practically speaking, adoption was often a means not only of securing an heir to whom a father would eventually pass his *patria potestas*, but also was used to form alliances between families or to secure, consolidate, or transfer political power.[131] The most prominent examples of adoption as a tool for the transfer of power are undoubtedly the adoptions of Roman emperors. Knowledge of imperial adoptions was spread through "images and legends of coins; construction and dissemination of

---

[125] Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 31.
[126] *"Si volet ire, quaerat senex ille qui petit quales et quot habeat maiores, quanta bona, an satis magno se possit addicere."*
[127] Peppard, *The Son of God*, 57.
[128] Kunst, *Römische Adoption*, 295.
[129] Peppard, *The Son of God*, 58.
[130] See Kunst, *Römische Adoption*, 231-64.
[131] Ibid., 299.

portraiture and other monuments; official texts and religious commemorations; and displays at public events."[132] For example, the *Acta Fratrum Arvalium* records several official religious honorings of adoptions, including the adoption of Nero by Claudius, where sacrifices were offered *ob adoptionem*.[133] The adoption of Hadrian by Trajan was publicized with coins bearing the word "ADOPTIO," and other coins from earlier imperial reigns also disseminated news of adoptions.[134] Inscriptions bearing dedications to Claudius and Domitian broadcast their adoptive lineage,[135] as did various permanent monuments in Rome.[136] Thus although the general public in the empire may not have been privy to all of the details of these high-profile adoptions, knowledge of them was certainly widespread even in remote parts of the Empire. Therefore, in light of these widely publicized acts of adoption, it is safe to presume that Paul's audiences would have been familiar with the Roman concept and ideology of adoption as a strategy for securing a son and heir.

4. Conclusion

Black observes that "every metaphor is the tip of a submerged model,"[137] and thus plumbing the depths of a metaphor's possible implications involves attempting to identify the model or models lurking below its surface. The role of the model is to provide the concrete object or real-world state of affairs that makes up the structure of the metaphor's vehicle, which in the case of this study is υἱοθεσία. However, I have shown in this chapter that determining which model or models are submerged beneath the metaphor is not necessarily a straightforward or simple process. For example, any number of creeping entities may be lurking beneath the surface of the creeping tomorrow in Macbeth's famous soliloquy. How are we to say precisely what kind of creeping creature or creeping thing comes to mind when Macbeth laments, "Tomorrow, and Tomorrow, and Tomorrow, Creeps in this petty pace from day to day." The beauty of the metaphor lies in the indeterminacy of its evocation of various

---

[132] Peppard, *The Son of God*, 69.
[133] Elio Pasoli, *Acta Fratrum Arvalium* (Bologna: Zuffi, 1950), 76-77.
[134] See Christopher Howgego, *Ancient History from Coins* (London: Routledge, 1995), 80-82; plate no. 132.
[135] Herrmann, *New Documents from Lydia*, 31-32; Auzépy, "Campagne de prospection," 342-43.
[136] See, e.g. Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.14 for a record of the altars of Tiberius and Livia; "Great Antonine Altar" at Ephesus; and various examples of portraiture of the adopted sons of Augustus (see Charles Brian Rose, *Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio-Claudian Period* [Cambridge Studies in Classical Art and Iconography, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997], 62-63 (plates 82, 94, 175, 212, 240), 71-72 (plates 151, 205).
[137] Black, "More about Metaphor," 31.

models. Is Tomorrow creeping the way the second hand of a clock seems to move agonizingly slowly? Or does Tomorrow shuffle along, an old man moving neither with conviction nor purpose through the mundane details of daily life? Or would Shakespeare have us view Tomorrow as something more insidious? Perhaps tomorrow is a predator creeping up on its unsuspecting prey? It is difficult to say that any of these models is the "correct" model, or even that one is present to the exclusion of the others within a single interpreter.[138]

In this chapter I have shown that there are many factors at play in explicating how the υἱοθεσία metaphors relate to their underlying models including: intertextual considerations, cultural differences between audience members, and varying levels of familiarity with the legal practice of adoption in the first century. In the analysis above I have attempted to cast a broad net in gathering the possibilities for constructing the underlying model of Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphors, and perhaps the indeterminate and imprecise nature of the relationships between a metaphor and its underlying models results in what can, at best, be described as a "rough sketch." Roughly then, the various literary sources from the three backgrounds all illuminate, to varying degrees, that adoption was considered a means of installing a son (and rarely a daughter) in a family (not of his birth) by means of legal decree, and that this relationship mirrored, to some extent, the relationship between a natural father and son. In both Greek and Roman sources where the legal practice of adoption is in view there is a strong connection between adoption and inheritance, and the purpose of adoption was to secure a suitable heir to take over the father's name and estate. Roman adoption rather uniquely emphasized the initiative and power of the *paterfamilias* in the adoption process, both in giving his children for adoption and receiving adoptive children *in potestate*. Though the Greek and Roman practices were divergent in some respects, Jewish, Greek, and Latin sources seem to indicate a fairly high level of cultural agreement on what adoptive relationships were, and also, in general, speak with consonant voices as to the general purpose of adoption.

However, though a broad general picture of adoption exists, there is no way of pinpointing exactly which features, which cultural assumptions, which legal practices, or which texts an audience member would associate with the metaphor. This is not to

[138] Indeed, the more we ruminate on a metaphor the more possible models come to mind, and often models mutually reinterpret and reinforce one another.

say that an audience member would associate a multitude of various features, but rather to say that various audience members would be unlikely to associate exactly the same features. To Jewish readers or gentile proselytes the Jewish features were likely more salient than the Greek adoption background. To gentile readers in Rome the high profile imperial adoptions may have been the most salient source for the metaphor's model. Furthermore, intertextual considerations nudge us to consider the possibility that these various models interpret and reinterpret each other in the new contexts of the Pauline metaphors.

Since it is impossible to determine which features of which models were associated by audience members and which were not, the best course of action in the exegesis of the υἱοθεσία metaphors is to consider the implications that arise from the broadest generalities of the models first and then proceed to what are seemingly less salient features. We must also keep in mind that not every aspect of a model is evoked by a metaphor, and so those aspects of the models that are at odds with Paul's argument in the context of Romans and Galatians can be eliminated from consideration. A sketch is by definition a rough representation of the nuances present in the various evocations by various hearers of the υἱοθεσία metaphors. Perhaps it is enough here to acknowledge the roughness of this sketch and the mysterious interplay between metaphor and model, and to treat the exegesis of the υἱοθεσία metaphors not as a clue or a message to be decoded, but as the appreciation of a diversely textured painting or a tightly woven and intricately sewn garment.

V. WE HAVE RECEIVED THE ADOPTION TO SONSHIP: THE ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ METAPHOR IN GALATIANS 4:5

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction to the Exegetical Chapters

The three preliminary chapters of methodological considerations have laid the groundwork for moving in a considerably different direction than the well-worn path of historical-grammatical exegesis. Whereas historical-grammatical exegesis tends to view the text as a container from which meaning can be extracted and dissected, my approach in the following chapters will attempt to treat the text more like a performance to be experienced. Whereas historical-grammatical exegesis often aims to distill metaphorical language into propositional statements, my approach aims to allow the affective and emotive potential of the υἱοθεσία metaphors to speak alongside their cognitive content. As Richard Hays pointedly remarks, "Can anyone seriously suppose that the best way to interpret the writings of an author [Paul]…is to paraphrase his ideas into univocal concepts?"[1] Taking a cue from Hays, I suggest at the outset of my exegesis that the success of the exegetical analysis should be measured by how effective it is in exposing the multivalent effects of Paul's metaphors, not by how well it paraphrases or discovers the "real meaning beneath the metaphor." This view is representative of a major paradigm shift that is occurring in the exegesis of other biblical metaphors,[2] and if Pauline scholars take seriously the insights from philosophical and cognitive approaches to metaphor, then it is also one that is necessary to adopt, and develop further, if we are to appreciate the artistry and power in Paul's writing.

Having established the importance of changing the interpretive framework through which metaphors are encountered in the first part of this thesis, the aim in the exegetical chapters is to encounter the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Paul afresh.

---

[1] Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, xxxiv.

[2] This view of metaphor is also seen in Howe, *Because You Bear This Name*; Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*; Gray, *Words and Pictures in Psalm 18*; Løland, *Silent or Salient Gender?* However, none of these studies have combined insights from philosophical approaches to metaphor with insights from cognitive and sociolinguistics in their methodologies, nor have they looked specifically at the effect of metaphor on perception and emotion.

Undoubtedly the new interpretive framework I have proposed will—at times—feel unfamiliar when it is put to use for exegesis. The most formidable difference in the following exegetical chapters is the shift from focusing solely on "what metaphors mean" to treating also "how metaphors mean." That is to say, in light of the methodological considerations elucidated in the previous chapters, the exegetical analysis will focus both on the textual aspects of the metaphor, and on how the υἱοθεσία metaphors shape extra-textual elements such as perception, emotion, and the formation of identity. Each chapter will have two distinct parts of analysis, the first focusing on identifying the υἱοθεσία metaphor in its individual context, its appropriate tenor and vehicle(s), and level of resonance in that context, and the second part focusing on its potential to structure the experiences and change the emotions and perceptions of its audience. While insights from these two parts might shed some light upon what and how these υἱοθεσία metaphors mean, an equally significant contribution of the exegesis is to provide an example of a new methodology for biblical scholars to utilize in reading and appreciating biblical metaphors.

1.2 Introduction to Galatians

In order to ascertain the full effect of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 some preliminary remarks regarding Paul's audience and, in particular, Paul's opponents in Galatia are necessary. First, although scholars are divided as to the provenance and addressees of Galatians,[3] there is a firm consensus that Paul's audience was made up of gentile believers.[4] Indeed Martinus de Boer remarks, "There is no indication that any of them are Jews by birth."[5] Although the date and location

[3] Although in the past the north Galatia theory has been supported by a formidable body of scholars (see e.g. J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, 10th ed. [London: MacMillan, 1890]; James Moffat, *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, 3rd ed. [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1933]; Martyn, *Galatians*), several new studies have begun to turn the tide toward scholarship favoring a south Galatia theory (see esp. Rainer Riesner, *Die Fruhzeit des Apostels Paulus: Studien zur Chronologie, Missionstrategie und Theologie* [WUNT 71, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1994]; Cilliers Breytenbach, *Paulus und Barnabas in der Provinz Galatien: Studien zu Apostelgeschichte 13f.; 16,6; 18,23* [AGJU 38, Leiden: Brill, 1996]; Thomas Witulski, *Die Adressaten des Galaterbriefes: Untersuchungen zur Gemeinde von Antiochia ad Pisidiam* [FRLANT 193, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000]; see also Graham Stanton, *Jesus and Gospel* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004], 35-46; Stephen Mitchell, *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods*, vol. 2 [Oxford: Clarendon, 1993], 3-10).

[4] See Betz, *Galatians*; Martinus C. de Boer, *Galatians* (NTL, Louisville: WJK, 2011); Martyn, *Galatians*, 16. A minority of scholars see some Jews as present in Paul's audience (e.g. W. D. Davies, review of *Galatians*, by Hans Dieter Betz, *RelSRev* 7.4 [1981]: 310-18; Mitchell, *Anatolia*, vol. 2, 5.

[5] De Boer, *Galatians,* 5.

of the original addressees of the letter are unquestionably important for the interpretation of other passages in Galatians (e.g. 2:1-15), the most salient feature of the addressees for interpreting the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 is the ethnic and religious background of Paul's audience. Regardless of whether one adopts a northern or southern hypothesis, or a pre-Jerusalem council or post-council date, James Dunn rightly remarks, "this uncertainty does not affect the question of whether the recipients were Jews or Gentiles…a description of the recipients as 'Galatians' almost certainly implies that non-Jews are in view."[6]

However, while scholars agree that Paul's audience was comprised of Gentiles, they disagree as to whether the Gentiles were "righteous gentiles" (or godfearers) prior to their contact with Paul,[7] or if the addressees acquired their competence and familiarity with Jewish practices and Scriptures through their interaction with Paul.[8] Nanos's claim that Paul's addressees were Gentiles involved with "Jesus subgroups" within the larger Jewish communities notwithstanding,[9] Paul's reference to ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας makes it far more likely that Paul's addressees were functioning as a community in their own right. There is a paucity of evidence that ἐκκλησία was used to describe local Jewish communities in a particular place,[10] which suggests that Paul uses the term to differentiate his audience from the surrounding religious subgroups.[11] Trebilco argues,

> Of course other (non-Christian) Jews *could have* used ἐκκλησία for their gatherings, as well as συναγωγή; it simply seems that, as far as we know, none of them were using ἐκκλησία with reference to a contemporary 'assembly' in the way they were using συναγωγή, and thus that ἐκκλησία was 'free.'"… Further, it became a way to

---

[6] James D. G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (BNTC, London: A & C Black, 1993), 6.
[7] E.g. Verena Jegher-Bucher, *Der Galaterbrief auf dem Hintergrund antiker Epistolographie und Rhetorik: ein anderes Paulusbild* (ATANT 78, Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1991), 14.
[8] Mark Nanos observes that most interpreters assume this is the case. However, he asserts that "such a conclusion is not warranted…the evidence for their status as pagans or righteous Gentiles prior to involvement with Paul, apart from arguable interpretive motives, is not clear" (*The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 77.
[9] Ibid., 317.
[10] Although there has been some recent discussion on the precise background of the term, scholars agree that ἐκκλησία was not a designation Jews used for their assemblies; see George H. van Kooten, "'Εκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ: The 'Church of God' and the Civic Assemblies," *NTS* 58.4 (2012): 535; Paul Trebilco, "Why Did the Early Christians Call Themselves ἡ ἐκκλησία?" *NTS* 57.3 (2011): 449-53; idem, *Self-Designations and Group Identity in the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 164-207; Gregory K. Beale, "The Old Testament Background of ἐκκλησία" (forthcoming); see also Wayne Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 74-110, esp. 80-81.
[11] Or possibly, as van Kooten argues, as an alternative to the civic assemblies ("'Εκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ," 536-48).

> *distinguish* themselves from ἡ συναγωγή, which we can understand was both desirable and necessary.[12]

Trebilco's argument that ἐκκλησία was a designation used to distinguish between Christ-followers and non-Christian Jews makes the scenario Nanos proposes unlikely. Therefore with the general scholarly consensus, the analysis below will proceed with the understanding that Paul's addressees in Galatians are gentile believers in Christ who became Christ-followers as a result of Paul's mission to the gentiles.

Describing the identity of Paul's opponents in Galatia is a much more thorny and difficult task, although for the purpose of examining the υἱοθεσία metaphor it is also much more important. Though currently there is a general consensus that Paul's opposition in Galatia were Jewish Christians,[13] the debate in scholarship still rages over the source and nature of the arguments Paul is trying to counter, and what label is appropriate for Paul's opposition. Several versions of an older theory purport that Paul was countering two rival messages, a Judaizing group and a group of pneumatics (freien Geister) who were exaggerating his teachings on Christian freedom.[14] Contrary to the widely held belief that the agitators were Jewish (either Jewish-Christians or non-Christian Jews), Johannes Munck argued that Paul's opposition was instead comprised of a group of law-observant Gentiles.[15] However, both of these theories have been discarded by recent Pauline scholarship, which overwhelmingly favors the view that Paul's opponents are law-observant Christian Jews who argued, "Christian existence takes place within the terms of the Jewish Torah covenant."[16]

Scholars who see Paul's opposition as some kind of Jewish Christian constituency still span a spectrum of views on how best to label them and as to what primary concerns they had with the gentile congregation in Galatia. Richard Longenecker unhesitatingly refers to Paul's opposition in Galatia as "Judaizers," and states, "Their message was therefore, in effect, one of both legalism for full salvation and nomism for Christian living."[17] J. Louis Martyn attempts to avoid the polemical connotation of "Judaizers," and instead adopts the label "Teachers." Despite their

---

[12] Trebilco, "Why Did the Early Christians," 456 (emph. orig.).
[13] Mark Nanos is the notable exception to this consensus (*The Irony of Galatians*, 316-18).
[14] Wilhelm Lütgert, *Gesetz und Geist: Eine Untersuchung zur Vorgeschichte des Galaterbriefs* (BFCT 22, Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1919); James H. Ropes, *The Singular Problem of the Epistle to the Galatians* (HTS 14, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929).
[15] Johannes Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*, trans. Frank Clarke (London: SCM, 1959), 89.
[16] Betz, *Galatians*, 8-9; see also Longenecker's summary of the research on the Galatian opponents (*Galatians,* lxxxviii-c).
[17] Longenecker, *Galatians*, xcviii.

differences in terminology, Martyn, with Longenecker, also concludes that these opponents are Christian Jews who "have connections both with Diaspora Judaism and with Palestinian, Christian Judaism.…[T]he Teachers are messianic Jews."[18] However, Martyn argues that the Teachers' primary concern was not law-observance for Christian living, but rather observance of the law as the means by which gentile Christians were to be included in God's people Israel.[19]

In contradistinction to Martyn and Longenecker, Nanos's designation of Paul's opposition as non-Christian, Jewish "influencers" represents a minority view. Nanos claims that his "reevaluation of the evidence suggests that the Galatian influencers were not believers in Jesus Christ, nor was their message good news of Christ."[20] While Nanos is to be commended for his insistence that neutral terminology for Paul's opposition is preferable to terms like "Judaizers," which can unduly skew the reading of the text,[21] most scholars have rejected his attempt to dissociate Paul's opposition from a Christian message (εὐαγγέλιον), based on Paul's own characterization of these agitators in the text of the letter (e.g. 1:6-7; 5:12; 6:12-13).[22]

In light of the designations proposed by various scholars above, it is clear that no designation is without its faults, nor will a designation be perceived with the same connotations by all. Therefore, however imperfect the term, I propose that the most agreeable solution is to adopt Paul's designation for his opposition as "the agitators" (οἱ ταράσσοντες). Moreover, although the literature on Paul's opponents in Galatia is already abundant, and I have little to add to the discussion, I would suggest here that in light of the focus of Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor it is likely that Martyn's view of the

[18] J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians*, 118.
[19] Ibid., 122-26.
[20] Nanos, *The Irony of Galatians*, 317. Nanos argues that non-Christian Jews are much more likely to have compelled the gentiles to conform to the norms of the Jewish community (ibid., 215-21), they have much more at stake in the debate over circumcision (ibid., 222-25), and that "Paul's critique of the influencers' lawlessness is based upon *his own interested view* in response to his understanding of Jesus as the Christ of Israel and Savior of the nations (ibid., 228 [emph. mine]).
[21] Ibid., 115-92.
[22] E.g. Martinus C. de Boer, review of *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*, by Mark Nanos, *BibInt* 12.4 (2004): 422; Peter Oakes, review of *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*, by Mark Nanos, *JSS* 49.1 (2004): 166-67; Erik Heen, review of *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context,* by Mark Nanos *JBL* 121.2 (2002): 376-77; Graham Stanton, review of *Irony of Galatians*, by Mark Nanos, *JTS* 56.2 (2005): 271. In addition, I would add that Paul's mention of "false believers" in 2:4 is implicitly drawing a parallel between the agitators in Jerusalem and the agitators in Galatia.

agitators as a group of Jewish Christians conducting a law-observant mission to the gentiles is the most apt characterization.[23]

Since it is unlikely that the agitators in Galatia were non-Christian Jews, as Nanos has suggested, the question most pertinent to sketching a characterization of these Christian Jews is undoubtedly, "To what end the law?" Is the law in the agitators' message functioning as a means to salvation and Christian nomism, or is it functioning as a boundary marker that distinguishes the "true children of Abraham" from the gentiles? While Longenecker's arguments for seeing the law as a means to salvation and Christian nomism have much merit and Scriptural support, this characterization of the agitators' message does not provide a satisfying explanation for Paul's sustained interaction with Abraham and his seed (3:6-9, 15-18, 23-29; 4:21-5:1) because Longenecker focuses too narrowly on the "full inheritance of the blessings of the Abrahamic covenant" for "those who rely on faith" and does not fully address the issue of spiritual lineage and the covenant, which seems to have been of preeminent importance to both Paul and the agitators.[24] Indeed, Paul's prolonged explanation of Abraham and his offspring suggests that a central message of the agitators involved law-keeping as a means of entrance into Israel and addressed the question, "Who are Abraham's true children?"[25] If a central part of the agitators' message focused on the importance of spiritual lineage, as I will argue in detail below, then the υἱοθεσία metaphor functions as a means of countering the claims of the agitators. In light of Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor, Abraham's offspring are not those who take upon themselves the yoke of Torah, but rather those who receive their spiritual lineage through their adoption by God. Accordingly, Martyn's view of the identity of the agitators as Christian Jews and the message of the agitators as the need for law observance to obtain the blessing and spiritual inheritance of Abraham is the most convincing option.[26]

---

[23] Martyn, *Galatians*, 117-26.
[24] Longenecker, *Galatians*, 112-16.
[25] Fee recognizes this as the central question in Galatians ("Who are Abraham's True Children?: The Role of Abraham in Pauline Argumentation," in *Perspectives on Our Father Abraham*, ed. Stephen Hunt (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 128-31; see also Martyn's discussion (*Galatians*, 302-306).
[26] Martyn, *Galatians*, 117-26.

1.3 Galatians 4:5 in the Context of Galatians

Most commentaries point to Galatians 4:4-5 as the crowning theological statement of Paul's letter.[27] The υἱοθεσία metaphor occurs at the heart of this statement; it is the culmination of the Son's mission of redemption. De Boer observes that Galatians 4:5 is a key component in the overarching theme of Galatians, which he identifies as the reception of the Spirit, and de Boer also argues that Paul's references to promise, sonship, and inheritance are all "different ways of articulating this overarching theme."[28] Furthermore, a key component to Paul's argument is the link between the Galatians' reception of the Spirit and their identity as children of Abraham. As Stephen Fowl remarks, "In the case of Galatians 3—4, Paul's most important act of power is his insistence that the story of Abraham should be read in the context of the Galatians' experience of the Spirit."[29] Of particular relevance for analysis of the υἱοθεσία metaphor is Paul's designation of gentile believers as "sons of Abraham" (υἱοί εἰσιν Ἀβραάμ) in Galatians 3:7. As Gunther Jüncker notes, "The reference to believing *Gentiles* as 'sons of Abraham' is both daring and subversive."[30] Leaving aside for a moment the group of whom Paul predicates υἱοθεσία (Jew or gentile), it is significant to first note that Paul's mode of receiving sonship in Galatians 4:5 is through the Father-initiated mission of redemption by the Son. Sonship is further connected with the reception of the Spirit who testifies that the believers are heirs through God, rather than through Abraham.

A further preliminary issue to consider is whether Galatians 4:4-5 are Paul's own composition or, as many have suggested, are a pre-Pauline fragment. Those who point to a pre-Pauline origin of these verses rightly observe the uniqueness of the description of the Son as "born of a woman" (γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός) and "born under the law" (γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον); these phrases appear nowhere else in the Pauline corpus. Furthermore, the chiastic structure of the two verses creates a memorable and creed-like formulation of the mission of the Son, which to some has

---

[27] E.g. de Boer, *Galatians*, 261; Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 85-137; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 177; Martyn, *Galatians*, 406.
[28] De Boer, *Galatians*, 250.
[29] Stephen Fowl, "Who Can Read Abraham's Story?: Allegory and Interpretive Power in Galatians," *JSNT* 55 (1994): 79.
[30] Gunther Jüncker, "'Children of Promise': Spiritual Paternity and Patriarch Typology in Galatians and Romans," *BBR* 17.1 (2007): 133 (emph. orig.).

suggested that these verses were drawn from a liturgical setting in the early church.[31] However, it is also quite possible that these verses are of Paul's own creation. In regard to the υἱοθεσία metaphor in particular, given the dearth of evidence for other Christian uses of υἱοθεσία outside of the Pauline corpus,[32] and Paul's peculiar affinity for the term at several crucial points in his own writing (Rom 8:15, 23; 9:4), it is at least a plausible explanation that the presence of υἱοθεσία in Galatians 4:5 points toward Pauline authorship of these verses. Nevertheless, the issue of their exact provenance will likely never be fully resolved, and as Hays remarks, "[E]ven if these Christological formulations have their origins in hypothetical pre-Pauline traditions, they are united, *at the level of Paul's usage of them*, in a single story-structure."[33]

For the purpose of analyzing the υἱοθεσία metaphor I will make two observations in regard to the issue of composition in verses 4-5: (1) even if these verses are a pre-Pauline fragment, Paul has appropriated and fully integrated the text in order to make his own point about the believers' sonship in relation to the Son, and (2) if Paul is using a well-known liturgical text or pithy statement to articulate his view of sonship then, being familiar to his audience members, it probably would have had an even greater impact on community identity. However, since there is no way of determining precisely the origin or audience's level of familiarity with this text I will treat it below as it stands in Paul's argument in Galatians, without speculating as to what impact it might have had if it were familiar to his audience already.

An additional preliminary issue that must be addressed is Paul's shifting pronouns in Galatians 4:1-7. The crux of the issue here is whether Paul is differentiating between Jews and Gentiles when he switches from the first-person

---

[31] See Betz, *Galatians*, 205-206; Martin Hengel, *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM, 1976), 10-11; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 166-72; Ulrich Luz, *Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus* (BEvT 49, Munich: Kaiser, 1968), 282-83; Franz Mussner, *Galaterbrief* (HTKNT, Freiburg: Herder, 1977), 271-74. Eduard Schweitzer's article is perhaps the most nuanced approach to the *Sendungsformel*, as he argues that 4:4-5 is not necessarily a fixed formula but an expression of a traditional "Denkschema." Schweitzer argues, "Da im Bereich der hellenistisch- jüdischen Weisheits- und Logosspekulation sowohl die Sendung als auch der Gottessohntitel zentral auftauchen, bei Philo (Agric. 51) im gleichen Kontext, da ferner die Struktur der Doppelsendung von Sohn und Geist in Gal 4:4-6 nur im Schema von Sap 9:10-17…eine Parallele findet, da endlich nur in diesem Kreis auch der Hinweis auf die dem einen Sohn entsprechenden 'Söhne Gottes' erscheint (Philo, Conf. Ling. 145—148), wie es Gal 4:6 der Fall ist, dürfte sich dort die Wurzel der Vorstellung finden" ("Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der 'Sendungsformel' Gal 4:4f. Rom 8:3f. Joh 3:16f. I Joh 4:9," *ZNW* 57 (1966): 207-208.

[32] With the only possible exception being Ephesians 1:5 if one rejects Pauline authorship, and even then it is striking that the only occurrence of υἱοθεσία outside of Pauline literature occurs in a letter clearly dependent on Paul's theological vocabulary.

[33] Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 111 (emph. orig.).

plural to the second-person plural. Scholars are relatively evenly divided between those who see Paul as including both Jews and Gentiles in his use of ἡμεῖς (Gal 4:3) and first-person plural verbs (ἦμεν νήπιοι; ἤμεθα δεδουλωμένοι; ἀπολάβωμεν), or if Paul is using the first-person plural here to designate Jews only, as he does in 2:15 and possibly also in 3:24-25. Scholars who view Paul as addressing two groups of people argue that, "[T]he apparently awkward shifts, from first person in verse 5 to second person in verse 6 and then back again, are necessary because Paul is talking about different groups of people."[34] Representative of this view, Longenecker remarks, "the first person plural of 4:3, as well as that of 4:5, ought to be understood as referring primarily to Jewish believers: in v 3 as Paul's application of his illustration of the Jewish experience under the custodianship of the law and in vv 4-5 as Paul's quotation of an early Jewish Christian confessional portion."[35]

However, despite the careful analysis and the cogent arguments of scholars who see the pronouns as differentiating Jew from gentile, there are good reasons for interpreting these pronouns as inclusive of both Jew and gentile throughout 4:1-7.[36] As Martyn remarks, "Skillfully using sometimes the first person plural—'we'—and sometimes the second person plural—'you' (with the addition once of 'the')—Paul paints a doleful picture of the whole of humanity."[37] One important issue to consider is whether Paul would use the phrase ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἤμεθα δεδουλωμένοι in 4:3 to refer solely to Jews, and whether it is parallel to ὑπὸ νόμον which occurs once in 3:23 and twice in 4:4-5. Clinton Arnold observes that there exists "a conceptual relationship between 'law' and *stoicheia*," but that the phrases are not necessarily coextensive.[38] Some scholars, such as Longenecker, who argue that the first person pronouns in 4:1-7 refer to Jewish Christians, take a positive view of the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, suggesting that they refer to the basic principles of religion for Jews (in 4:3) and for gentiles (in 4:9).[39] Under this scheme, ὑπὸ νόμον and ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου are parallel in 3:23 and 4:3, but not in 4:9 where

[34] John Taylor, "The Eschatological Interdependence of Jews and Gentiles in Galatians," *TynBul* 63.2 (2012): 312.
[35] Longenecker, *Galatians,* 164.
[36] Richard Hays put forth a mediating view which sees the referent change in the middle of verse 5 from Jews alone to Jews and Gentiles (*Faith of Jesus Christ*, 101).
[37] Martyn, *Galatians*, 385.
[38] Clinton Arnold, "Returning to the Domain of the Powers: *Stoicheia* as Evil Spirits in Galatians 4:3, 9," *NovT* 38.1 (1996): 68.
[39] Longenecker, *Galatians*, 165-66; see also Linda Belleville, "'Under Law': Structural Analysis and the Pauline Concept of Law in Galatians 3:21-4:11," *JSNT* 26 (1986): 53-78.

πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα refer to the "ineffectual regulations and principles"[40] which enslaved the gentiles. Although this scheme allows for a more positive view of the Torah, it seems difficult to maintain that the στοιχεῖα refer to different things in 4:3 and 4:9, particularly because the στοιχεῖα are depicted negatively as an enslaving (δεδουλωμένοι) element in 4:3.

However, if the στοιχεῖα in 4:1-9 are taken to enslave both Jews and gentiles, and if ὑπὸ νόμον is taken as a phrase of close association, then the entire passage can be read as Paul's grim picture of universal humanity. Arnold rightly observes, "[T]he *stoicheia* are seen only in terms of their malevolence in Galatians 4."[41] Even if one does not see the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου as demonic beings,[42] it is still quite possible to understand them negatively. Martyn argues that the στοιχεῖα and the Law are "parallel entities, both having the power to enslave.…Thus, the universal 'we,' who were held under the power of those elements (4:3), are almost certainly the same persons as 'those' who were held under the power of the Law (4:5)."[43] Similarly, de Boer points out that Paul could be including gentiles in his description τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον (4:4-5) in order to emphasize the "universal scope of God's redemptive activity," which in de Boer's view, "corresponds to—and addresses—the universal scope of the human predicament."[44] The parallelism between the στοιχεῖα in 4:3 and 4:9 strongly suggests that Paul intends the pronouns throughout the passage to be read inclusively, particularly when one closely examines the relationship between verses 5 and 6.

Not only are the arguments I have just discussed for interpreting the first person and second person pronouns as differentiating between Jews and gentiles unconvincing, it also seems unlikely that ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν refers to Jews alone, as those who see these two groups represented separately in the pronominal shifts in 4:1-7 must claim. Rather, there is both internal and external evidence that suggests that Paul's intention is to include both Jews and gentiles in his argument throughout 4:1-9. First, contrary to Longenecker's assertion that υἱοθεσία

---

[40] Belleville, "Under Law," 70.
[41] Arnold, "Returning to the Domain," 63. At one point in his article Arnold argues that ἤμεθα in 4:3 refers only to Jewish Christians ("Ibid., 60). However, Arnold later argues, "The *stoicheia* are initially presented as guardians who exerted an enslaving influence (ἤμεθα δεδουλωμένοι; Gal. 4:3) over *both Gentiles and Jews*" (Ibid., 64 [emph. mine]).
[42] So Ibid., 55-76.
[43] Martyn, *Galatians*, 393.
[44] De Boer, *Galatians*, 264.

"was probably also a word used within the Judaism of Paul's day and by Jewish Christians generally," there is no evidence in other Jewish sources that this was the case.[45] Moreover, in Romans 9:4 υἱοθεσία is listed as one of the historic privileges of Israel, and there Paul is quite clearly referencing the period of time before the Christ-event. Although it is slightly anachronistic to use Paul's statement in Romans 9:4 as evidence against υἱοθεσία pertaining to Jewish Christians alone in Galatians 4:5, it does seem unlikely that Paul would single out the sonship of Jewish-Christians specifically in Galatians since he is also willing to use the term to describe the status of the Israelites prior to Christ's coming in Romans 9:4.[46] If, in Paul's mind, Jewish Christian have already received adoption to sonship (Rom 9:4), why must he single them out as the recipients of adoption in Christ in Galatians 4:5? In contrast, Paul's use of υἱοθεσία in Galatians 4:5 seems to have strong parallels to his use in Romans 8:15, where both Jewish and gentile believers are in view.

Second, if the pronouns in 4:1-7 are meant to differentiate between Jews and gentiles, then it is difficult to explain the relationship between verses 5 and 6. According to those who hold that τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον refers only to the Jews, the assertion in verse 5 that the Son was sent ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν refers only to Jewish believers. Then in verse 6 Paul's shift to the second person form of εἰμί indicates that it is the Galatian gentiles who are being spoken of as sons. John Taylor claims,

> In 4:6 Paul, after recognising the redemption and adoption (υἱοθεσία) of those under the law through the action of the Son of God, declares that 'you are sons'; the second person ἐστέ ('you are') refers to the Gentile Galatians. Both passages then describe the reception of the Spirit by Jewish believers as a *result* of the new eschatological status of the Gentiles.[47]

However, Taylor's assertion creates an unnatural disjunction between υἱοθεσία in verse 5 and the υἱοί in verse 6. Although Taylor attempts a theological explanation of the shift in reference, the semantic relationship between υἱοθεσία and υἱοί makes it

---

[45] Longenecker, *Galatians*, 172. Longenecker points to Romans 9:4-5 which he also sees as a pre-Pauline list of privileges. However, there is no evidence that υἱοθεσία was used as a designation for Israelite sonship by other Jewish writers or communities. See the discussion above in section 3.1 of chapter 4 and below in section 3 of chapter 7.

[46] See also Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 71. However, although she makes a similar point about the relationship between Gal 4:5 and Rom 9:4, Hodge thinks that υἱοθεσία in Gal 4:5 refers *solely* to the gentiles.

[47] Taylor, "Eschatological Interdependence," 293.

unlikely that these two terms refer to different groups of people when they occur in such close proximity to one another, especially since Paul does not make mention of an explicit differentiation in their respective references. Another possible solution is that the referents change somewhere in the course of 4:1-7 so that ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσίαν is inclusive of the gentile believers, but ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ and Paul's example in 4:1-3 refer to Jewish believers.[48] However, this is problematic because it requires two different referents for the first person forms in verse 3 (ἡμεῖς, ἦμεν, ἤμεθα) and in verse 5 (υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν). This might seem possible upon first glance, but Paul's explanation of the significance of adoption in verse 7 (ὥστε οὐκέτι εἶ δοῦλος ἀλλ' υἱός) ties together Paul's example from 4:1-3 and his reference to redemption (ἐξαγοράσῃ) in verse 5. In light of this evidence, it seems more likely that the pronouns throughout Galatians 4:1-7 are inclusive of both Jewish and gentile believers, underlying both the universality of humanity's enslavement and the totality of the scope of the Son's mission of redemption.

The final preliminary issue that must be considered is the meaning and use of αββα ὁ πατήρ in Galatians 4:6. Of course, there is already extensive research and debate surrounding the precise meaning, use, and origins of the '*abbā* prayer, and thus here it is necessary only to broadly sketch the contours of this research and to briefly address its relevance for interpreting the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5.[49] In correlation with the meaning and background of the '*abbā* prayer, the possible intertextual connections the '*abbā* prayer evokes must also be considered, since these intertextual relationships are also interanimated in the context of the υἱοθεσία metaphor and the '*abbā* prayer in Galatians 4:5-6.

Undoubtedly the most well-known research on the meaning and origin of the '*abbā* prayer was carried out by Joachim Jeremias, which appeared in several influential publications.[50] Jeremias argued that '*abbā* was "a children's word, used in

---

[48] See, e.g., Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 101.

[49] See especially James Barr, "'Abba' isn't 'Daddy'," *JTS* 39 (1988): 28-47; Joachim Jeremias, *Prayers of Jesus* (SBT II 6, London: SCM, 1967) 11-65; Géza Vèrmes, *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels* (London: Collins, 1973), 210-11; idem. *Jesus and the World of Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), 40-42; for a recent survey and critique of the research on the Abba prayer see Georg Schelbert, *Abba Vater: Der literarische Befund vom Altaramäischen bis zu den späten Haggada-Werken* (NTOA 81, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 17-35.

[50] Joachim Jeremias, *Abba: Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966); idem, *The Central Message of the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1965), 9-30; idem, *Prayers of Jesus*, 11-65; idem, *New Testament Theology*, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM, 1971), 61-68.

everyday talk," and, in his view, "it would have seemed disrespectful, indeed unthinkable, to the sensibilities of Jesus' contemporaries to address God with this familiar word."[51] Although Jeremias himself did not believe that Jesus' use of '*abbā* reflected the "chatter of a small child," but rather acknowledged that "even grown-up sons addressed their father as '*abbā*,"[52] because Jeremias' research relied heavily on his assertion that '*abbā* and '*immā* were the babbling sounds of small children, many of his followers, especially at the popular level, have persisted in equating '*abbā* with the English translation "Daddy."[53] Jeremias also spoke of "the complete novelty and uniqueness of *Abba* as an address to God in the prayers of Jesus."[54] However, Jewish scholar Claude Montefiore asserts "The characteristic note of Jewish piety in this [i.e. the New Testament] age is the thought of God as father – not the father of the people only, as in the Old Testament, but of individuals,"[55] and Géza Vèrmes argues that Jesus' use of '*abbā* has significant parallels with its use in the prayers of Jewish charismatics.[56]

Casting Jeremias' theory into an even more dubious position are the numerous examples from both Palestinian and Diaspora sources where God is invoked as the father of individuals, particularly as father of the wise and righteous person. For example, in Wisdom 2:16 the righteous man boasts that "God is his father" (ἀλαζονεύεται πατέρα θεόν), and in 3 Maccabees 6:4 the vocative is used to address God directly ("Father [πάτερ], you destroyed Pharaoh"). Thus Jeremias' claim that no one besides Jesus addressed God as father is difficult to maintain.[57] Moreover, Sirach, a document of indisputably Palestinian origin, records a prayer to God as "Lord, Father, and God of my life (κύριε πάτερ καὶ θεὲ ζωῆς μου) (Sir 23:4)." Although Jeremias dismisses these examples as insufficiently parallel to Jesus' use, or because, in his view, they have been unduly influenced by Hellenism, Allen Mahwhinney is surely correct in his assertion that "the evidence indicates that building upon OT texts

---

[51] Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, 67.
[52] Ibid.
[53] E.g. Elaine Herrin lamented the increasing casualness of prayer language among both clergy and laity in her article "Hello, 'Daddy, God'; Goodbye, Dignity: If You Really Love Jesus Don't Honk," *Christianity Today* 28.12 (1984): 88.
[54] Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, 67.
[55] Claude G. Montefiore, *The Old Testament and After* (London: Macmillan, 1923), 203.
[56] Vèrmes, *Jesus the Jew*, 210-11.
[57] Jeremias dismisses the importance of *3 Macc.* 6.4 because of its Hellenistic origin and thus the vocative is "due to Greek influence" (*The Central Message of the New Testament*, 16).

such as Prov 3:12; Ps 68:5; 103:13 there was a developing individualistic perception of the fatherhood of God in Judaism around the time of Jesus' earthly ministry."[58]

However, this is not to say that Jesus' use of the Aramaic address to God as '*abbā* was insignificant. Indeed, although Barr takes issue with many of Jeremias' claims regarding ''*abbā*, he acknowledges, "It is fair to say that '*abbā* in Jesus' time belonged to a familiar or colloquial register of language, as distinct from more formal and ceremonious usage," but that it also "was not a childish expression comparable with 'Daddy': it was a more solemn, responsible, adult address to a Father."[59] Although '*abbā* only appears once in the Gospels (Mark 14:36), the Gospels more frequently record Jesus addressing God with the vocatives πάτερ and πάτερ μου (Matt 6:9/Luke 11:2; Matt 11:25/Luke 10:21; Luke 23:34, 46; Matt 26:42; John 11:41; 12:27-28; 17:1-25), and it is possible that the '*abbā* address underlies these occasions as well.[60] Moreover, although Jesus' address may not have been unique among first-century Jews, Jesus' use of '*abbā* and "father" as addresses to God "enables us to see into the heart of his relationship with God as he understood it."[61]

Though various critiques of Jeremias' work have cast doubt on the exclusivity of Jesus' use of the '*abbā* prayer,[62] it is likely that the preservation of the Aramaic form among the Pauline gentile audiences of Romans and Galatians derives from Jesus' own use of the address. Moreover, Schelbert suggests that the connection forged by υἱοθεσία that makes the gentile audience the "seed of Abraham" through Christ also might account for Paul's use of the foreign, Aramaic address.[63] Thus the significance of the '*abbā* cry in Galatians 4:6 (and Rom 8:15) lies in believers' experience of sonship "*as an echo and reproduction of Jesus' own experience.*"[64] Moreover, Paul's employment of αββα ὁ πατήρ in Galatians 4:6 also undoubtedly evoked rich intertextual relationships with texts from the Jewish tradition that portray YHWH as the Father of Israel who loves, provides for, disciplines, and protects his covenant people (e.g. Deut 8:5; 14:1; 32:6; Isa 1:2; 63:7-8; Jer 31:9; Mal 1:6).

---

[58] Allen Mawhinney, "God as Father: Two Popular Theories Reconsidered," *JETS* 31.2 (1988): 184.
[59] Barr, "'Abba' isn't 'Daddy'," 46.
[60] See James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit* (London: SCM Press, 1975), 24; though Barr's caution is also warranted, "While it is *possible* that all cases in which Jesus addresses God as 'father' derive from an original '*abbā*, it is impossible to *prove* that this is so"(Ibid., 46).
[61] James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit* (London: SCM Press, 1975), 24.
[62] See esp. Schelbert, *Abba Vater*, 17-34.
[63] Ibid., 56.
[64] Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 22 (emph. orig.).

Mawhinney notes that these Old Testament texts demonstrate that within Judaism "the thought of God's fatherhood implied that his people could confidently draw near to him," but also that they "implied the responsibility of the son."[65] Given the multivalent nature of intertextual relationships, it is likely that these Old Testament references underlie both Jesus' use of the address and its subsequent iterations among gentile Pauline audiences. These intertextual connections are woven into the cognitive framework created by the υἱοθεσία metaphor, which further emphasizes for Paul's Galatian audience that their experience of the Spirit evidences that the God of Israel has brought them into relationship with himself.

2. Metaphor and Text

2.1 The Metaphorical Utterance

In the earlier discussion on metaphorical meaning I indicated that this study will assume that a metaphor's meaning exists at the level of a complete metaphorical utterance, rather than a single word being "used metaphorically."[66] I also noted that a metaphor need not be in the construction "*X* is a *Y,*" but rather can occur as any part of speech, such as the direct object of a verb as is the case in Galatians 4:5.[67] Of the four metaphorical utterances I will consider in this study, the metaphorical utterance containing υἱοθεσία in Galatians 4:5 is arguably the most textually straightforward in that it is part of a discrete clause, and there are no glaring grammatical ambiguities (e.g. Rom 8:15) or textual issues (e.g. Rom 8:23). Using Soskice's understanding of a metaphorical utterance, the metaphorical utterance containing υἱοθεσία in Galatians 4:5 is ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν. However, the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 occurs as part of a larger cluster of metaphors, and because Paul clearly intends these metaphors to be considered as parts of a composite picture rather than in isolation, it is important also to identify how the other metaphors in Gal 4:5-7 relate to one another both grammatically and conceptually.

The first issue to consider is how the two ἵνα clauses of verse 5 relate to one another. Identifying the relations within the cluster of metaphors is slightly more complicated for those interpreters who see part, or all, of verse 5 referring only to

---

[65] Mawhinney, "God as Father," 187.
[66] See sections 2.3 and 3.1 of chapter 2; see also Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 24-53.
[67] See section 3.1 of chapter 2; see also Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 20-23.

Jews. Most commentators who see the pronouns as differentiating between Jews and Gentiles argue that Paul includes himself with his Jewish compatriots by using the pronoun "we." Thus "we" throughout the passage refers to the Jews, who are also the ones "under the law" (ὑπὸ νόμον). As described earlier, by arguing that the metaphors in verse 5 refer to a different group than those in verse 6, this construal of the pronouns places an artificial wedge between the series of closely related metaphors that span verses 5-7 (ἐξαγοράσῃ, υἱοθεσία, υἱοί, ἀββα ὁ πατήρ, οὐκέτι εἶ δοῦλος, and ὁ κληρονόμος). For example, Taylor attempts to explain the relationship between verses 5 and 6 by arguing, "Paul is claiming that God sent the Spirit of his Son into the hearts of Jewish believers, including Paul, *because* the Gentiles, including the Galatian believers, are now sons."[68] This interpretation might solve the exegetical issues surrounding Paul's shifting pronouns, but it makes little sense of the metaphors in these verses. First, I have already remarked that it is highly unlikely that Paul's readers would have separated υἱοθεσία in Galatians 4:5 from the immediate mention of ἐστε υἱοί into two distinct referents, as Taylor suggests. Moreover, it is odd that Taylor's interpretation of the pronouns would also require the δοῦλος metaphor in verse 7 to pertain to Paul's gentile readers, when in Taylor's scheme of verses 1-3 (and implicitly in 5) the δοῦλος metaphor refers to the situation of the Jews. Upon closer examination, Taylor's analysis requires his readers to ascertain that the Jews are adopted, but not referred to as sons or heirs, and the gentiles are sons and heirs, but are not included in those who receive "adoption." Given the close link between the terms in the metaphor cluster (υἱοθεσία, υἱοί and ὁ κληρονόμος) it is highly unlikely that the audience would distribute the referents of these metaphors between two separate groups of people.

Taking a more balanced and tenable position, Hays argues that the structure in Galatians 4:5 is God "sending forth his Son to bring redemption to those under the Law (=Jews), adoption to 'us' (= Gentiles) and the gift of the Spirit to all who are 'sons' (=Jews and Gentiles together.)"[69] Hays' approach makes more sense of the cluster of metaphors in Galatians 4:5-7, though it still requires that the readers differentiate between the group receiving redemption (the Jews) and the group receiving adoption (Jews and gentiles). Thus in Hays' view, though it is a less abrupt

[68] Taylor, "Eschatological Interdependence," 312.
[69] Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 101.

interpretation, the gentiles are still inserted into the cluster of metaphors midstream. Though grammatically both Hays and Taylor offer a plausible interpretation, it seems more likely that *the cluster of related metaphors* in Galatians 4:1-7 has the same referent throughout.

In Galatians 4:1-7, Paul begins a new cluster of metaphors in verse 1 which function as an extended example to explain the situation of the heirs (κληρονόμοι) in 3:29. Sam Tsang observes that there is significant overlap between the metaphors in Galatians 3:15-4:1-7 and the vocabulary related to inheritance in descriptions of Greco-Roman households.[70] Indeed, Paul commences by using an extended metaphor of an underage heir (ὁ κληρονόμος νήπιός ἐστιν) to speak about the situation of the heirs of the promise (4:1). [71] Paul then attaches another metaphor to the heirs when he proclaims them to be no different from a slave (οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου). He continues the slavery metaphor in the next verse (4:3) when he explains that likewise "we were enslaved under the elemental spirits of the world" (ὑπὸ τὰ σοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἤμεθα δεδουλωμένοι). Thus by the time Paul reaches verse 4 he has already developed a string of related metaphors, and it is unnatural to allocate these metaphors to separate groups when the images are so closely related. Thus, in light of the metaphors in 4:1-7 building upon the heirs (κληρονόμοι) in 3:29 (where both Jews and gentiles are clearly in view [3:28]) it is most likely that Paul is also including both Jews and gentiles in the first series of metaphors in 4:1-3; therefore in verse 5 both redemption (ἐξαγοράσῃ) and adoption (υἱοθεσία) are being universally extended through the Son's mission (Gal 4:4). The result of this mission of redemption and adoption is that both Jewish and gentile believers are sons (v. 6a), receive the Spirit who cries "*abbā*, Father" (v. 6b), and are no longer slaves (v. 7), but heirs through God (v. 8). If the metaphors are read as a cluster there is a discernable progression from slavery to sonship brought about by the Son's mission of redemption and adoption, and given the overlap between the metaphors in 4:1-3 and 4:5-7 it seems difficult to separate

[70] Sam Tsang, *From Slaves to Sons: A New Rhetoric Analysis on Paul's Slave Metaphors in His Letter to the Galatians* (Studies in Biblical Literature 81, New York: Peter Lang, 2005), 117.

[71] Keesmaat also argues for a high level of continuity between 3:23-29 and 4:1-7 by appealing to the exodus narrative. She claims, "Not only does Paul's terminology in 4.1-7, therefore, support the exodus as the interpretative context for these images," and Paul's story "parallels the exodus narrative" (*Paul and His Story: (Re)interpreting the Exodus Tradition* [JSNTSup 181, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999] 173). However, her analysis is heavily reliant on Scott's interpretation of Gal 4:1-7 (see also the discussion in section 2.2 below) and she does not adequately consider the possibility that the link between 3:23-29 and Paul's example in 4:1-3 lies in Paul's layering of metaphors to explain οἱ κληρονόμοι.

their referents into metaphors pertaining to Jewish believers and metaphors pertaining to gentiles.

2.2 The Frame: 4:1-7

The frame, or the immediate surrounding context, of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians ostensibly begins at 4:1 and ends at 4:7, with λέγω δέ introducing Paul's explanatory example and the example concluding with Paul's assertion ὥστε οὐκέτι εἶ δοῦλος ἀλλ' υἱός· εἰ δὲ υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος διὰ θεοῦ in verse 7. However, there are several incongruences in Paul's example that make elucidating the frame of the metaphor somewhat difficult. First, Paul's example in verses 1-3 presupposes that the underage heir is already a member of the household, which makes Paul's inclusion of υἱοθεσία in verse 5 quite jarring.[72] Second, although most scholars read Paul's example through the lens of Greco-Roman law and customs,[73] the specifics of the example (esp. ἐπίτροπος and οἰκονόμος) do not ostensibly comport with external evidence.[74] This has led some to view Galatians 4:1-7 as an exodus typology,[75] which attempts to solve some of the exegetical difficulties presented by the Greco-Roman background, which will be discussed below. Although I have argued strongly that metaphors may have more than one underlying model, I also noted that the possible underlying models of the υἱοθεσία metaphors are not necessarily equally salient in each occurrence of a υἱοθεσία metaphor.[76] In Galatians 4:1-7, despite some of the objections to reading Paul's example through a Greco-Roman lens, I will show that the Greco-Roman household provides a satisfying frame for the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5.

Since the publication of Scott's monograph on the Pauline adoption passages there has been a growing number of scholars who have followed his assertion that

---

[72] *Pace* Gordon Fee who argues, "In its most immediate context this word [υἱοθεσία] picks up the analogy of vv. 1-2 and refers to the time when the 'son' enters 'maturity'" (*Galatians: A Pentecostal Commentary* [Pentecostal Commentary Series, Dorset: Deo Publishing, 2007], 150). Frank Matera remarks, "The introduction of the adoption theme is somewhat disruptive since Paul's example presupposes that the heir is a son or daughter even though he does not explicitly say so" (*Galatians*, [SP, Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992], 156).

[73] E.g. Betz, *Galatians*, 208-209; De Boer, *Galatians*, 264-65; Dunn, *Galatians*, 217-18; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 169-70; Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons*, 81-99; Martyn, *Galatians*, 390-91.

[74] See Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 137-48.

[75] See especially Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 121-86; Keesmaat, *Paul and His Story*, 155-88.

[76] I note also that there is not necessarily a contradiction in seeing a plurality of models underlying the metaphorical utterance in which υἱοθεσία occurs (i.e. the utterance evokes both models of Greco-Roman adoption and Jewish sonship) and arguing that the metaphor's frame (Gal 4:1-7) draws upon one background (i.e. a Greco-Roman household) to the exclusion of another (i.e. the Exodus motif).

Galatians 4:1-7 constitutes Paul's retelling of the "Second Exodus."[77] Scott claims, "The Exodus typology of the passage sets the sending of the Son (v. 4) in a traditional, messianic framework, which suggests that the υἱοθεσία of the sons (v. 5) should be interpreted in light of the Jewish expectation of divine adoptive sonship in the messianic time based on 2 Sam. 7:14."[78] To support his claim Scott argues that rather than ἐπιτρόπους καὶ οἰκονόμους referring to some kind of legal background for "guardians and overseers" as in the consensus view,[79] these terms "may well refer to the traditional taskmasters of Egypt."[80] However, Scott freely admits that the terms for the Egyptian taskmasters were not established in the first century,[81] and John Goodrich further observes, "During the Greek and Roman periods, both ἐπίτροπος and οἰκονόμος were used to identify the slave or freedman agents and administrators who managed the estates of their principals."[82]

Moreover, Scott's argument rests heavily on reading Galatians 4:1-7 in light of the 2 Samuel 7:14 tradition, and Scott thus identifies the heir, and by extension also the adopted sons, in the passage as referring to collective Israel.[83] However, it seems unlikely that Paul's reference to ὁ κηλρονόμος in Galatians 4:1 would refer to Israel as a collective, given that Paul has just used κληρονόμοι in conjunction with τοῦ ᾽Αβραὰμ σπέρμα in verse 29 to refer to those "who belong to Christ," and defined the "sons of Abraham" not as the collective of Israel but as οἱ ἐκ πίστεως (Gal 3:7), thus including gentiles in the scope of those who receive the inheritance. Furthermore, it is problematic that Scott's argument relies on the ability of Paul's audience to screen out any previous understanding they might have regarding ἐπίτροπος, οἰκονόμος, and

---

[77] See especially Keesmaat, *Paul and His Story*, 155-88; see also Fee, *Galatians*, 145-51; Matera, *Galatians*, 156-58.
[78] Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 186.
[79] E.g. Dunn, *Galatians*, 210; Fung, *Galatians*, 179-81; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 165; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 164; Martyn, *Galatians*, 387-88; Jürgen Becker makes the interesting observation that the colocation of the two terms could be stylistic, stating, "Eine Mehrzahl und Doppelung verschiedener Aufsichtpersonen ist unüblich. Vielleicht liegt Einfluss von der Sachaussage vor: Gesetz und Weltelemente bilden eine Doppelung, und letztere repräsentieren auch eine Pluralität" ("Der Brief an die Galater," in *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser, Philipper, Kolosser, Thessalonicher und Philemon* (NTD 8, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), 47).
[80] Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 143.
[81] Ibid., 144.
[82] John K. Goodrich, "Guardians, not Taskmasters: The Cultural Resonances of Paul's Metaphor in Galatians 4.1-2," *JSNT* 32.3 (2010): 265. Goodrich's article has a very thorough summary of the primary sources where ἐπίτροπος and οἰκονόμος are used to denote guardians and estate managers ("Guardians, not Taskmasters," 262-73).
[83] Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 128-129.

υἱοθεσία in order to perceive the thickly cloaked exodus typology Scott sees lying behind Paul's words.

Though beset with its own difficulties, reading Galatians 4:1-3 against Greco-Roman legal customs and household life provides a much more likely schema for how Paul's first audience would have understood his example. Critics of the Greco-Roman background point to the example's presumption that the Father remains alive throughout the passage, and the lack of parallel examples where ἐπίτροπος and οἰκονόμος are used to name figures in a Roman *familia*.[84] They further point to the incongruence of Paul's insertion of υἱοθεσία where his example presupposes that the underage heir is a natural son of the Father.[85] Though these criticisms are warranted, there are plausible contextual explanations for why Paul chose to word his example as he did, deviating slightly from the routine procedures of a Greco-Roman household.

Regarding the first objection to a Greco-Roman background, there are two possible explanations for Paul's portrayal of the Father as both alive and able to control the appointed time the son came of age (ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρός). The first explanation is that an example need not comport in precise detail to the specifics of a legal code in order to be understandable to an audience.[86] Indeed, Paul explains his example sufficiently in its immediate context that the discrepancies with Greek or Roman law fade somewhat into the background. This is particularly true in Paul's assertion that the Father sets the time when the son comes of age, which was, in fact, fixed by the government in Roman law.[87] Justinian records that males are released from tutelage upon puberty, which Roman law defined as, "*post quartum decimum annum completum.*"[88] However, although it does not comport with the specifics of Roman law, Paul's insistence on the Father's action in setting the time undergirds his main point: the Son came at the initiative of the Father in the fullness of time (ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου). Throughout the letter of Galatians Paul is quite attuned to questions of time, mission, and eschatology. Indeed Martyn has

---

[84] E.g. ibid., 137-40; Keesmaat, *Paul and His Story*, 169.
[85] Instead, Keesmaat argues that υἱοθεσία in Galatians 4:5 "highlights the actual act of adoption, which took place for Israel in the exodus" (*Paul and his Story*, 164).
[86] See Longenecker, *Galatians*, 164; Matera, *Galatians*, 148-49.
[87] E.g. *Inst. Iust.* 1.20.6; 1.22; see also Max Kaser, *Das Römische Privatrecht: Das Altrömische, das Vorklassische und Klassische Recht*, vol 1. (Munich: Beck, 1971), 362-63.
[88] *Inst. Iust.* 1.22; I note that there are several other ways for a tutelage to end, such as upon the fulfillment of a condition set by a testamentary tutelage (*Inst. Iust.* 1.22), or upon the death of the tutor or pupil (*Inst. Iust.* 1.22), however the details in Galatians still do not comport with Roman law since Paul indicates that the minor son's age of maturity is *appointed by the Father.*

remarked that the two central questions in Galatians are "What time is it?" and "In what cosmos do we actually live?"[89] Thus it would seem that while some of the elements in Paul's example do not comport with the particulars of Roman law, these same elements do fit well within Paul's understanding of eschatology and the Father's initiation of the Son's mission.

Another possible explanation for Paul's portrayal of the Father in the example is that it is not as incongruous with Roman practices as critics allege. Although it is perhaps typical to speak of inheritance in connection with the death of the *paterfamilias*, it is by no means unintelligible to designate a son as an heir prior to the death of the Father.[90] Indeed, the primary reason for adoption within Greek and Roman practices was to secure an heir, whether the adoption was a testamentary or *inter vivos* adoption.[91] In addition, it is important to note that "the appointed time" (ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμίας) in the text does not refer to the son inheriting, but rather the Father's indication of the son's majority. Admittedly, Paul's analogy does break down insofar as a human heir in Greco-Roman culture does not inherit until the Father's death, however this is to be expected when illustrating divine truths with human analogies.

Although Scott attempts to identify the ἐπίτροπος and οἰκονόμος with the Egyptian slave masters, citing that they are not technical terms for members of a Greek or Roman household,[92] others have argued persuasively that these terms do in fact correspond to figures, such as guardians and estate administrators in a private household.[93] Within the New Testament ἐπίτροπος is used to refer to a steward or the manager of private affairs within a wealthy household (e.g. Matt 20:8; Luke 8:3). Similarly, Aristotle remarks, "All people rich enough to avoid personal trouble have a steward (ἐπίτροπος) who takes this office, while they themselves engage in politics and philosophy" (*Pol.* 1255b35-37). Likewise, οἰκονόμος can refer to a slave in a managerial position over an estate, such as the ὁ πιστὸς οἰκονόμος ὁ φρόνιμος steward in Luke 12:42. This meaning of οἰκονόμος is also attested by several

[89] Martyn, *Galatians*, 23.
[90] See Peppard, *The Son of God*, 54-57; Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," 51-58.
[91] See sections 3.2. and 3.3 of chapter 4 for a discussion of the specific practices of Roman and Greek adoption.
[92] Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 135-40.
[93] E.g. Betz, *Galatians*, 203-204; Goodrich, "Guardians not Taskmasters," 265-73; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 162-64; Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," 62-63.

inscriptions found throughout Asia Minor.[94] Although Scott is correct that ἐπίτροπος and οἰκονόμος are not technical terms *per se*, they are still appropriate and recognizable designations from the domestic sphere of Greco-Roman life. In light of this evidence,[95] Goodrich rightly concludes that ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους ἐστὶν καὶ οἰκονόμους "forms a hendiadys, emphasizing a single concept: the provisional authority placed over the minor."[96]

The most troubling element of the metaphor's frame, regardless of whether one sees 4:1-7 as a retelling of the exodus event or as an example from a Greco-Roman household, is that Paul abruptly inserts υἱοθεσία into an analogy that ostensibly presupposed that the heir was the natural son of the Father. This is admittedly a difficult element of the analogy to explain by appealing to Greek or Roman customs, however it is not out of place in the larger context of Paul's understanding of sonship in Galatians. Throughout Galatians 3 Paul carefully constructs sonship around the promise of Christ as the seed, through whom the Galatians are named heirs of the promise and sons of Abraham. Bruce Longenecker observes that Paul's explanation of Abrahamic descent is "focused on Christ rather than on the believer," and that "[t]he mechanism in this christological argument is not simply one of similarity of characteristic (i.e., 'faith'), as in 3.6-7, but of incorporation into true Abrahamic descent by means of participation with Christ."[97] Indeed, a key component to Paul's argument throughout seems to be that sonship is bestowed through Christ, not inherited through natural descent or obtained through keeping the law. If this is the case, then despite the incongruity with the earlier part of his example, Paul's use of υἱοθεσία fits quite well with his overall presentation of sonship when considered against the entire message of Galatians.

---

[94] See e.g. Sencer Şahin, *Bithynische Studien* (Inschriften greichisher Städte aus Kleinasien 7, Bonn: Habelt, 1978), no. 12; Marijana Ricl, "Varia Epigraphica," *EA* 35 (2002): 111; Thomas Corstan, "Zu Inschriften aus Kleinasien," *EA* 37 (2004): 112-13; Stephen Mitchell, *Regional Epigraphic Catalogues of Asia Minor II: The Ankara District, the Inscriptions of North Galatia* (British Institute of Archeology at Ankara Monograph 4, Oxford: B. A. R. 1982) nos. 34, and 324.

[95] See also Goodrich's extensive documentation of the use of ἐπίτροπος and οἰκονόμος in both the public and private spheres ("Guardians not Taskmasters," 265-78).

[96] Ibid., 273.

[97] Bruce Longenecker, *The Triumph of Abraham's God: The Transformation of Identity in Galatians* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998), 133.

2.3 Model, Tenor, and Vehicle

As noted in chapter 2, this study will rely on Soskice's definition of a metaphor as "that figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another."[98] Soskice further defines the "one thing" as the metaphor's tenor and the "terms which are seen to be suggestive of another" as the vehicle.[99] Therefore an integral part of the analysis for each chapter will be to delineate the tenor and vehicle of each metaphor in which υἱοθεσία occurs. I also argued that a metaphor's vehicle evoked a model (or models), which are the concrete objects or states of affairs that provide the structure for the metaphorical vehicle. Therefore in each instance of a υἱοθεσία metaphor it is necessary to determine the metaphor's tenor and vehicle, and examine which models (or models) are most likely to have been evoked. Furthermore, although there will seemingly be significant overlap between identifying the metaphor's proper frame and its tenor, model, and vehicle, it is necessary to consider each of these elements independently; theoretically, Scott's "frame" of a second exodus could be inappropriate but it could function as the tenor of the metaphor, or a Jewish model could underlie the metaphor even though the frame is more evocative of a Greco-Roman household. Thus, all possible options need to be considered for each part of the metaphor independently in order to arrive at the most robust understanding of how the component parts of the υἱοθεσία metaphor function as a composite whole.

I will begin by identifying the vehicle and model since in Galatians 4:5 these are the simplest tasks. In the previous section the metaphorical utterance was identified as ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν. Since the vehicle is a term present within the text,[100] in this text the vehicle is unquestionably υἱοθεσία. Thus in Gal 4:5 Paul is speaking about the tenor in terms which are seen to be suggestive of υἱοθεσία. However, the vehicle υἱοθεσία can evoke multiple models, and not all of the possible models are equally salient in every context, and so it is necessary to consider which models are most likely to be evoked in this metaphor in Galatians 4:5.[101] As I described in chapter 4, there are three primary models for υἱοθεσία: Greek adoption,

---

[98] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15.
[99] Ibid., 45-51.
[100] See Richards, *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 96-99; Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 27-28; Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 46.
[101] See also Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 47-51.

Roman adoption, and Jewish sonship/adoption.[102] Scott has argued that this text should be read through the lens of Jewish adoption, primarily because, as discussed in the previous section, he sees Galatians 4:1-7 as an exodus typology rather than as an example from life in a Greco-Roman household. Scott argues that this text should be read with a model drawn from an Old Testament adoption metaphor, to the exclusion of all other models.[103] Thus, according to Scott, the text in Galatians 4:5 is not drawing upon a Greco-Roman model of adoption, despite his equally fervent assertion that the conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία is "adoption," and never "sonship."[104]

If Soskice is correct in her suggestion that a vehicle can evoke more than one model,[105] then Scott's argument for a single model in Galatians 4:5 is already tenuous. Moreover, while Scott's analysis does introduce a certain amount of coherence to the narrative of Galatians 4:1-7,[106] ultimately his analysis of both the model and the frame of the υἱοθεσία metaphor fails to address how the audience of the letter, which was predominantly comprised of gentiles, would have understood the υἱοθεσία metaphor. As others have argued, it is quite possible to read Galatians 4:1-3 as an analogy drawn from a Greco-Roman household.[107] Indeed, if Paul's audience was primarily gentile, then it is highly unlikely that they would be able to disassociate the Greco-Roman model even if they also associate models of Jewish sonship,[108] particularly if they do not perceive the text through Scott's framework of a second exodus.

In contrast, it is far more likely that Paul's gentile audience in Galatia would have associated a Roman model of adoption.[109] This is particularly true if the

---

[102] As I have noted, Scott's argument for Jewish adoption rests on what he terms a Hebrew "adoption formula" which he sees at play in various texts in the Old Testament, but especially in 2 Sam 7:14 (*Adoption as Sons*, 61-120). However, it is by no means clear that Scott's formula is equivalent to the Greco-Roman or Pauline uses of υἱοθεσία. For a more detailed discussion see section 2.2 of chapter 4. Nevertheless, to fairly represent Scott's central thesis I will use his terminology of "Jewish adoption" whenever I discuss his argument in the chapters that follow.

[103] Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 116-117, 267-70.

[104] Ibid., 55; see also the discussion in section 2.1 in chapter 4 regarding the conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία.

[105] See section 2.3 of chapter 2 for a discussion on vehicle and model.

[106] This is not necessarily to say that Scott's account of the narrative is convincing, but rather that his account of the narrative imports the structural coherence of the exodus and unifies Scott's version of the story in Galatians 4:1-7.

[107] See especially Goodrich, "Guardians not Taskmasters," 251-84.

[108] Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," 42.

[109] See section 3.3 of chapter 4 for a discussion of the evidence for a Roman model of adoption; also noteworthy here is Kunst's demonstration that there was no uniform terminology, but rather a variety of "adoption formulae" in Roman adoption practices (*Römische Adoption*, 14).

predominant evocation of the frame of the metaphor is of a situation in a Roman household, since adoption was a fairly common practice in the Roman context. Moreover, because the metaphor occurs in the midst of a series of action verbs (ἐξαπέστειλεν, ἐξαγοράσῃ), it is likely that υἱοθεσία as a vehicle is particularly evocative of adoption as a *mode of entrance* into sonship. Hodge remarks that Galatians 4:5 describes "mythic, originary moments for gentiles-in-Christ."[110] Stated differently, Paul's metaphor is perhaps more likely to evoke a model that connects the "making of sons" in the event of adoption to an action taken by the Father, which is the case both in Greco-Roman adoption and in Galatians 4:5. Indeed, Kunst argues that adoption projects a framework of the ideal Roman family,[111] which comports well with the action of the Father in Galatians 4:1-7 who exhibits some characteristics typical of the *paterfamilias* of a Roman household, such as appointing guardians and overseers for his minor son, initiating the act of adoption, securing an heir, and so on. However, it is impossible to rule out any model entirely, and so the analysis below will proceed under the assumption that the Greco-Roman model is predominantly in view with the possibility that some audience members would also have associated Jewish sonship with the vehicle υἱοθεσία.

While identifying the metaphor's vehicle is fairly straightforward, delineating the metaphor's tenor presents a more complex matter. Recall also that while the tenor is the metaphor's subject, it is not adequate to speak of the tenor "stripped of its vehicle" rendering υἱοθεσία as a metaphor *for X*.[112] The three most likely candidates for the tenor in Galatians 4:5 are: (1) Paul is speaking about the "second exodus" in which the collective Israel receives sonship/adoption through the Christ-event, (2) Paul is speaking about "salvation" in terms of adoption, (3) or Paul is speaking about God's mission to bring believers into relationship with himself in terms of adoption. Although options two and three look similar, the following analysis will show that the third formulation of the tenor is preferable.

If we were to take the first tenor, the metaphor would be rendered "speaking about the second exodus in terms which are seen to be suggestive of υἱοθεσία." If

[110] Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 77. *Pace* Hodge, I would argue that υἱοθεσία in Gal 4:5 pertains to all believers, both Jew and gentile, however Hodge's point about υἱοθεσία as an "originary moment" is precisely correct.
[111] Kunst, *Römische Adoption*, 194.
[112] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 48-49. See section 2.3 of chapter 2 for a fuller discussion of the tenor and vehicle.

Scott were using metaphor theory, this would likely be his formulation since he argues that the first half of Gal 4:1-7 "refers to the redemption from bondage in Egypt and the υἱοθεσία of Israel at the time of the Exodus," and the second half "probably refers to the eschatological redemption (ἐξαγοράζειν) and υἱοθεσία expected in the messianic time (vv. 3-7)."[113] However, we have already seen that it is unlikely that the singular ὁ κληρονόμος refers to the collective of Israel, which means that it is also unlikely that υἱοθεσία refers to the collective Israel receiving adoption either implicitly in verses 1-2, or explicitly in the second exodus Scott identifies in verse 3-7. Moreover, even if the tenor of the metaphor is the second exodus, Scott ultimately fails to show how this subject relates either to the message of Galatians as a whole or to his audience.

Although the second option reflects the majority consensus, it is problematic for the approach I have taken for analyzing metaphors because it replaces one metaphor (υἱοθεσία) with another (salvation). It is almost customary to speak of υἱοθεσία as a metaphor "for salvation." Indeed, Burke remarks, "there has been an increasing awareness and appreciation among systematicians and New Testament scholars that *huiothesia* is another soteriological metaphorical expression for the apostle Paul."[114] Of any of the occurrences of υἱοθεσία in the Pauline corpus, the text in Galatians 4:5 is perhaps the only text where speaking of "salvation" in terms suggestive of υἱοθεσία might be appropriate, given the text's strong emphasis on the divine action of the Father's sending of the Son on behalf of believers. However, despite the fact that scholars prefer and utilize the vocabulary of "salvation" or "soteriological metaphors" to speak about a range of metaphors in Paul (e.g. justification, redemption, reconciliation, etc.), it is also true that "salvation" has its own set of Pauline texts where it is used metaphorically (e.g. Rom 1:16; 10:1; 11:11; 13:11; 2 Cor 1:6; 6:2; 7:10; Phil 1:28; 2:12; 1 Thess 5:8).[115] Despite its popularity as a shorthand designation for a diverse collection of Pauline metaphors, "salvation" is not a specific or precise enough tenor to fully articulate the various dimensions of the text

[113] Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 149.
[114] Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*, 37-38.
[115] I would also point out here that "salvation" has become so engrained in the vocabulary of biblical studies that it might be tempting to object that it is not a metaphorical term (see section 2.3.4 of chapter 2 for a discussion on living and dead metaphors). However, Paul also uses σωτηρία in Phil 1:19 in a conventional context, which is typically translated "deliverance," presumably because of the theological freight that "salvation" carries.

in Galatians 4:1-7. Therefore, for clarity's sake in analyzing the metaphor in Galatians 4:5 I propose a slightly more cumbersome, but less "metaphorical" tenor for the υἱοθεσία metaphor.

Rather than speaking of "salvation" in terms suggestive of υἱοθεσία, I propose to render the tenor of the metaphor as "God's mission to bring believers into relationship with himself." At first blush this sounds quite similar to "salvation," however it is preferable to remove a term which itself is such a central biblical metaphor (σωτηρία) and substitute instead a tenor with a non-metaphorical construction. Moreover, constructing the tenor in terms of mission and relationship highlights the primary thrust of the text, which is undoubtedly the mission of the Son who was sent by the Father. Martyn cogently argues, "[T]he Son's sending is an invasion of cosmic scope, reflecting the apocalyptic certainty that redemption has come from outside, changing the very world in which human beings live."[116] With this emphasis on mission being highlighted in the construction of the tenor, the metaphor in Galatians 4:5 would be rendered, "that figure of speech whereby we speak about God's mission to bring believers into relationship with himself in terms which are seen to be suggestive of adoption."

2.4 Emphasis and Resonance

Most scholars recognize that Paul's choice of υἱοθεσία in Galatians 4:5 is a striking departure from the example he has set up in verses 1-3,[117] however it is perhaps less clear whether the metaphor in Galatians 4:5 qualifies as emphatic and resonant under Black's classification of metaphors identified in my second chapter.[118] A metaphor is emphatic "to the degree that its producer will allow no variation upon or substitute for the words used."[119] It is widely acknowledged that υἱοθεσία was not a well-worn metaphor in the first century,[120] and I further suggested that because of its relative scarcity, each of the NT uses of υἱοθεσία likely maintains a high degree of novelty.[121] In the context of Galatians 4:1-7, the υἱοθεσία metaphor is emphatic both

[116] Martyn, *Galatians*, 408.
[117] Martyn remarks, "The legal custom portrayed by Paul in vv. 1-2 leaves no place for the motif of adoption" (Ibid., 386).
[118] See section 2.2.2 of chapter 2.
[119] Black, "More About Metaphor," 26.
[120] See e.g. Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*, 37-41, and Dunn, *Galatians*, 217.
[121] See section 2.3.4 for a discussion on novelty.

because of its relative scarcity and because υἱοθεσία evokes such specific and exact models (particularly the Roman model) for the mode of entrance into sonship. Given Paul's example of the νήπιος in verses 1-3, one might have expected him to say that the Son redeemed those under the law so that they might receive their inheritance as sons, or so that they might be deemed adult sons. But conversely, as Burke observes, "The time of which Paul speaks is not one which ripened of its own accord but one which was of God the Father's own choosing…Paul's point is that the climactic moment of salvation has been sovereignly engineered by God the Father which culminates in υἱοθεσία."[122] Paul's choice of υἱοθεσία communicates instead that the *Son's mission* rather than the heirs reaching the age of majority on their own accord, resulted in the believers' adoption to sonship. Paul's departure from the structure he sets up in his example of the underage heir suggests that he chooses υἱοθεσία in verse 5 precisely because any potential variant or substitute could not communicate the distinct emphasis of υἱοθεσία on sonship. Therefore, in this context the metaphor containing υἱοθεσία is emphatic, as evidenced by both the abrupt shift in Paul's original example and the level of specificity communicated by υἱοθεσία as a mode of entrance into sonship.

While it is fairly evident that the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 is emphatic, its level of resonance is a more complicated question. According to Black a metaphor is resonant to the degree that it will support "a high degree of implicative elaboration."[123] There are several factors in Galatians 4:5 that suggest the υἱοθεσία metaphor is constrained to a smaller implicative elaboration. First, the example of the underage heir in verses 1-3 is tightly focused on the relationship of the heir to the father, the heir's minority, and the status of the heir who has reached majority as appointed by the Father. Belleville ties these themes together in her succinct summary of the passage, "Through faith they have entered into the age of sonship, a sonship that comes from belonging to the seed through whom the Gentiles have become fellow heirs with the Jews apart from the Law."[124] It is also worth noting that these three elements are all "vertical elements," meaning that they are all elements that impinge upon the believer's relationship with God. However, the shifting pronouns throughout verses 1-7 make it somewhat difficult to identify the precise group to

[122] Burke, "Adopted as Sons," 270-71.
[123] Black, "More About Metaphor," 26.
[124] Belleville, "'Under Law,'" 61.

whom υἱοθεσία applies, which may have moderately weakened the vertical elements present in the implicative complex because the audience may have had difficulty identifying themselves as the referent. In addition, because Paul chooses to outline a few specific implications, such as the relationship with the Father and the link between adoption and the status of "heir," the metaphor's other possible implications that are not overtly mentioned in the text (e.g. the horizontal relationships between audience members) are probably not as prominent for most audience members. Therefore, although the metaphor is quite emphatic, its resonance is limited to the vertical elements Paul chooses to include in the context, which in this case function as constraints to the implicative complex of the metaphor. Moreover, it is likely that his audience members identified themselves as the referent of the υἱοθεσία metaphor and thus saw themselves participants in these vertical elements, though it is possible that Paul's ambiguous pronouns weakened these connections for some of his hearers/readers.

2. Metaphor and Audience

Having established the parameters and fleshed out the features of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 as a literary feature of the text of Galatians in the previous section of this chapter, I will now direct the analysis beyond the text and toward what Richards terms the "intercourse of thoughts," that is, toward an examination of the metaphor's effect on cognition, perception, emotion, and identity. In chapter 3 I argued that metaphors were powerful, constructive agents that had tremendous potential for creating particular conceptions of a particular subject and for creating intimate bonds between an author and the hearers/readers of a metaphor. Moreover, I argued that metaphors can become symbols of identity within a particular community by creating bonds between community members and constructing boundaries between members and outsiders. The analysis below will treat each of these areas that the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 might have influenced, highlighting the key ways the metaphor might have shaped the perceptions, emotions, and identity of Paul's gentile audience in Galatia.

3.1 Metaphor and Perception

I argued above that the primary implications of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 were the specific "vertical implications" that Paul develops in verses 1-

7. Here I will argue that these vertical implications provide the audience with a correlated cognitive structure that Paul attaches to a particular event in the community's history: the reception of the Spirit. As Betz remarks, "In terms of the phenomenology of religion, the ecstatic experience of the Spirit should be called 'objective' evidence, and this coincides with Paul's argumentation, while the concept of sonship is a matter of 'subjective' self-understanding."[125] Although Betz perhaps overstates his case a bit by calling the reception of the Spirit "objective evidence," he is right to point out that the event of receiving the Spirit was mutually recognized common ground between Paul and his Galatian audience. Paul has already referred to the reception of the Spirit in order to dissuade the Galatians from taking upon themselves the yoke of the law (Gal 3:2), and in chapter 4 he again appeals to their experience of the Spirit as the basis for their sonship. In connecting the Galatians' experience of receiving the Spirit with his υἱοθεσία metaphor, Paul is nudging the audience to perceive this experience "actively and recreatively," and the metaphor functions to "compose it, to make sense of it."[126]

In Galatians 4:5 the cognitive structure Paul erects through the υἱοθεσία metaphor provides a lens for the actions of all three members of the Trinity.[127] Fee remarks, "As always God the Father is the subject of the saving verbs; but his saving activity has been carried out through the redemptive activity of the Son, who has inaugurated God's eschatological salvation, with its inclusion of Jew and Gentile alike as his own children; and that saving activity has been made effective by the Spirit of the Son whom the Father sent 'into our hearts.'"[128] In Galatians 4, the Father's initiative, the Son's mission, and the Spirit's testimony are all processed through the cognitive structure created by the υἱοθεσία metaphor, as Alfio Buscemi aptly observes, "[L]a huiothesia è la nuova condizione esistenziale del cristiano, voluta dal Padre, attuata dalla missione del Figlio e vissuta nello Spirito."[129] In addition, the υἱοθεσία metaphor provides the cognitive structure that enables the

---

[125] Betz, *Galatians*, 210.
[126] Lanham, *Analyzing Prose*, 3.
[127] I am aware that the term "Trinity" might be deemed anachronistic. However, Galatians 4 is arguably one of the earliest colocations of the three members of the Christian godhead, and has long been recognized as a key passage for the later construction of the doctrine; see also Aranda, "Imagen de Dios en Cristo," 605, 611-15; Buscemi, "Liberta' e Huiothesia," 116-36; Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*, 72.
[128] Fee, *Galatians*, 148.
[129] "Υἱοθεσία is the new existential condition of the Christian, willed by the Father, implemented by the mission of the Son, and lived in the Spirit" (Buscemi, "Liberta' e Huiothesia," 106).

believers to see themselves as heirs and descendants of Abraham, which, of course, is a key component to Paul's argument throughout Galatians 3 and 4 (3:7, 14, 25-29; 4:5-7, 28-31). Each of these components will be outlined in further detail below, in order to more fully illuminate the cognitive framework constructed by υἱοθεσία in the context of Galatians 4:1-7.

The Father is perhaps the most prominent figure throughout Galatians 4:1-7. He appears in Paul's example in verses 1-3 as the authority over the heir who is responsible for setting the point of transition for His son's adulthood (ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρός), though arguably in verses 1-2 the father could refer to any human father. However, it is clear in verse 4 that God the Father is in view (ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ), and verse 6 explicitly identifies God as αββα ὁ πατήρ. Correspondingly, the cognitive structure created by Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor draws the actions of the Father into sharp relief. Through the cognitive structure of the υἱοθεσία metaphor, Paul's audience perceives the Father as the initiator of their relationship with the members of the Trinity. Martyn remarks, "in the context of this new family the word 'Father' is thereby redefined on the basis of *God's* identity."[130] In the context of Galatians 4:1-7 the Father is revealed as the one who sets the appointed time, and who sends the Son. Regarding the "fullness of time," De Boer observes, "The event of Christ's being 'sent forth' is the proof of the matter. Only in retrospect can a believer recognize 'the fullness of time' as 'the date set by the Father.'"[131] Indeed, in this same way Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 constructs the perception of the Father's role as the initiator of relationship with the believers that is accomplished through the sending of his Son. Moreover, the Spirit testifies to the Father's actions in the cry, αββα ὁ πατήρ.

In connection with the believers' adoption, the '*abbā* prayer attributed to the Spirit grounds the believers' sonship in their tangible experience of receiving the Spirit. Thus, the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 creates the perception for Paul's audience that their reception of the Spirit is evidence of their relationship with God the Father. Furthermore, the underlying models and intertextual connections reinforce the actions that Paul explicitly mentions in the text. Greek and Roman practices of adoption are initiated and carried out under the authority of the Father, which accords

[130] Martyn, *Galatians*, 387.
[131] De Boer, *Galatians*, 262.

very well with the characteristics of the Father in Galatians 4:1-7. Texts from the Old Testament record YHWH as the Father who consistently pursued a relationship with his covenant people. Therefore, by evoking these models and intertextual connections, υἱοθεσία in Galatians 4:5 creates a cognitive structure in which the Father initiates and carries out the formation of an intimate relationship with his sons, which Paul connects to their tangible experience of receiving the Spirit.

The believers' adoption in Galatians 4 is also plainly connected with the mission of the Son. Although it is the Father who sends the Son, the Son is the active agent in Galatians 4:5, who takes on flesh (γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός), and the yoke of the law (γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον). The two ἵνα clauses, whether they are read as purpose or result, indicate the effect of the Son's mission upon the believers.[132] Thus "the purpose and goal of Christ's coming into the world was the redemption of both Jews and Gentiles."[133] The cognitive framework constructed by the υἱοθεσία metaphor creates the perception that the Son is the agent who effected adoption to sonship by his gracious action of interchange.[134] James Dunn remarks, "What is set in contrast…is the ordinary humanness of God's Son in his mission, and the adoption of ordinary human beings to divine sonship."[135] Thus the υἱοθεσία metaphor urges the believers in Galatia to view their adoptive sonship through the accomplished mission of the Son.

Galatians 4:4-5 makes clear that the mission of the Son is the efficient cause for the believers' adoption, though it is also worth noting that in this passage Paul does not communicate *how* the Son accomplished this mission (i.e. his death and resurrection are noticeably absent).[136] This point is a matter of debate among interpreters, with some, such as Betz, arguing that there is a "discrepancy" between the christological formulations in 3:13-14[137] and 4:4-5 that "cannot be

---

[132] It is unwise to draw too fine a distinction between purpose and result in Koine Greek, "in many cases purpose and result cannot be clearly differentiated, and hence ἵνα is used for the result that follows according to the purpose of the subj. or of God" (BDAG, 378).
[133] Betz, *Galatians*, 208.
[134] See also Morna D. Hooker, *From Adam to Christ: Essays on Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 59-60.
[135] Dunn, *Galatians*, 215.
[136] On this point see Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 101-102.
[137] Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξαγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα…ἵνα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ γένηται ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος λάβωμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως.

harmonized,"[138] since in 3:13 Christ becomes a "curse" on the cross and in 4:4-5 it is the Son's *life* under the law that is in view. However, Hays argues that 3:13-14 and 4:3-6 "fit together like pieces of a jigsaw puzzle to form a single coherent story line."[139] Hays correctly continues, "[I]t is unthinkable to read the christological formulation in 4:4-5 without recognizing that here also Paul certainly presupposes Christ's death as the central action in the gospel story, although he does not explicitly mention it."[140] In light of Hays's observation, it is also true that the cognitive structure created by the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 is grounded in the life and death of Son, thereby creating a strong perception of connection and identification with the Son as the adoptive sons participate in the divine "interchange."[141]

Paul further undergirds the Son's connection with the believers' adoption by indicating that the Spirit the believers received is τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ. By connecting the Son's mission to both υἱοθεσία and the reception of the Spirit, Paul constructs a cognitive framework that allows the audience to perceive their reception of the Spirit in terms of their own adoption brought about by the Son's mission. As de Boer remarks, "[F]or Paul the sonship of believers becomes evident in the experienced fact that God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into their collective hearts."[142] Thus, like the Father's sending, the Son's mission is inextricably linked with their experience of the Spirit and their perception of themselves as adopted sons of God.

Though the Spirit is not mentioned until verse 6 of Paul's example of sonship, the entire example hinges upon the Spirit's role in the believers' υἱοθεσία. As I have already argued, Paul is using the audience's experience of the Spirit to ground his υἱοθεσία metaphor, and thus it is crucial for Paul that his audience connects the reception of the Spirit with the initiative of the Father and the mission of the Son to bring about their adoption to sonship. Fee similarly asserts, "It is this twofold reality, both its historical objectivity and its experienced realization, that makes his [Paul's] present argument work, since it is their actualizing of the 'sonship' Christ provided through the experienced life of the Spirit that serves for Paul as the certain evidence

---

[138] Betz, *Galatians*, 207 n. 51. Betz continues, "How these two passages relate to each other doctrinally and historically is difficult to say" (*Galatians*, 207 n. 51).
[139] Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 109.
[140] Ibid.
[141] Hooker, *From Adam to Christ*, 59-60.
[142] De Boer, *Galatians*, 265.

that he is right and the agitators are wrong."[143] I would add that the precise element which constructs the cognitive framework of the υἱοθεσία metaphor around the experience of the Spirit as evidence of the believers' sonship is the ὅτι clause at the beginning of verse 6. The causal clause signals the audience members to interpret the reception of the Spirit occurring *as a result of their adoption*. In addition, the Spirit testifies to the involvement of the other two members of the Trinity, as Paul names the Spirit τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ (the Spirit of his Son), and declares that the Father sent the Spirit into their hearts. Moreover, the declaration is placed in the mouth of the Spirit, who cries out αββα ὁ πατήρ in the heart of the believer. Thus the Spirit is both the foundation for the cognitive framework of the υἱοθεσία metaphor and the key element in confirming and testifying to the believers' identity as sons and heirs of God. The cognitive framework constructed by the υἱοθεσία metaphor creates the perception that all three members of the Trinity are intimately involved in the adoption of the believers. This framework is built upon the audience's experience of the Spirit, which Paul here interprets for his audience through the framework of υἱοθεσία. It is crucial to note that Paul does not assume that their experience of the Spirit is self-interpreting,[144] but rather he uses it to ground the υἱοθεσία metaphor in order to create a particular perception of the experience for his audience members.

3.2 Highlighting and Hiding

I argued in chapter 3 that the cognitive structure a metaphor creates is not a neutral conduit of information, but rather it functions as a particular lens for the metaphor's tenor, highlighting some features while hiding others.[145] In the exegesis of a metaphor, it is thus necessary to consider what features of the tenor the metaphor brings to the fore, and perhaps even more significantly, which elements the metaphor is potentially suppressing. In the case of Galatians 4:5, these elements are perhaps best considered in light of two other major themes of the letter: (1) the faithfulness and sufficiency of Christ, and (2) the true children of God. Working in support of these two themes, the υἱοθεσία metaphor highlights the Son's divine mission that accomplishes the adoption of the Galatian believers, and the sufficiency of this

---

[143] Fee, *Galatians*, 151.
[144] See Fowl, "Who Can Read Abraham's Story," 79.
[145] See section 2.1 of chapter 3; see also Gibbs, *The Poetics of Mind*, 142; Lakoff and Turner, *More Than Cool Reason*, 39.

mission to create sons and heirs of God apart from works of the Law (3:2). Conversely, the metaphor hides the primacy of Abraham and the Law for obtaining sonship of God, and therefore full acceptance into the community, which was presumably at least part of the message of Paul's opponents.[146]

Galatians 4:4-5 stands as the theological center of the pericope. These verses succinctly summarize the Son's mission to bring people out of bondage and into the adoption to sonship of the Father. Longenecker aptly comments, "Set in the context of a fulfillment motif the statement tells us that Jesus, God's Son par excellence, is the culmination and focus of all of God's redemptive activity on behalf of humanity."[147] The emphasis of these verses rests squarely on the Son's actions, initiated by the Father, and therefore highlights the Son's faithfulness and obedience in carrying out the mission of adoption. Despite the fact that Paul's christological formulation in Galatians 4:5 does not specifically mention the cross, nevertheless his statement evokes the whole of the Christ story by making mention of a single part.[148] Thus the mention of the Son's birth under the law (γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον) for the purpose of redeeming those under the law (ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ) in 4:4-5 also creates a cognitive framework that highlights the Son's death on the cross that forms an integral part of Paul's argument in the preceding chapters (e.g. Gal 2:19; 3:1; 3:13-14). Therefore, what is highlighted through the Father's sending of the Son to bring about the υἱοθεσία of believers in 4:5 is that the Son "died faithfully for human beings while looking faithfully to God."[149]

The dire situation of believers is also highlighted through the use of the slavery metaphor, further emphasizing the radical change in position accomplished by the Son. Adolf Schlatter observes, "Seine eigene Untertänigkeit ist der Preis, mit dem er uns die Entlassung aus dem Gefängnis des Gesetzes erwirbt."[150] In Galatians 4:5,

---

[146] See also John M. G. Barclay, *Obeying the Truth: Paul's Ethics in Galatians* (Vancouver: Regent College Publications, 2005), 52-54; G. Walter Hansen, *Abraham in Galatians: Epistolary and Rhetorical Contexts* (JSNTSup 29, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 167-74; Longenecker, *The Triumph of Abraham's God*, 128-34; J. Louis Martyn, "A Law-Observant Mission to the Gentiles: The Background of Galatians," *SJT* 38.3 (1985): 317-23; Martyn, *Galatians*, 294-306, 343-44, 432-57.
[147] Longenecker, *Galatians*, 170.
[148] See Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 109.
[149] Martyn, *Galatians*, 271.
[150] Adolf Schlatter, *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser, Kolosser und Philemon* (Erlaüterungen zum Neuen Testament 7, Stuttgart: Calwer, 1963), 106; n.b. Schlatter reads ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (v. 3) and ὑπὸ νόμον (v. 5) as parallel phrases, but his point about the interchange accomplished by Christ's subjection stands even if one takes them as referring to two different forms of enslavement.

Paul's use of ἐξαγοράζω connotes "the purchasing of a slave in order to free him."[151] In addition, Galatians 4:1-3 brings to the fore that the Galatians' former state of slavery entails being "subject as a slave to an alien will,"[152] and existing in the "state or condition of being held as chattel by another."[153] Furthermore, when δουλόω is used in combination with τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (Gal 4:3), and τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσιν θεοῖς (Gal 4:8), the idea Paul communicates is one of absolute obedience, and more specifically, obedience under compulsion. The bleak situation of humanity communicated through the slavery metaphors serves to highlight the believers' adoption as the "cosmic change enacted by God" and carried out through the initiative of the Father through the Son's faithful death.[154] Through the use of the slavery and υἱοθεσία metaphors in Galatians 4:1-9 Paul draws clearly into view the successful mission of the Son to bring them into relationship with the Father.

An attendant and significant attribute that the υἱοθεσία metaphor highlights is the *sufficiency* of the Son's mission to effect the adoption of believers apart from works of the law; this is true whether or not one affirms all or any part of the New Perspective view of ἔργα νομοῦ. For example, if one takes a "Lutheran" approach to "works of law," then the function of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 is to highlight that believers attain sonship not by their own merit, or by keeping the Law, but rather they receive sonship as a gift from the Father, brought about by Christ, and testified to by the Spirit.[155] This is evident in Paul's contrast between the Son's active "redeeming" of those under the law and the description of the Galatian believers as those who "receive the adoption to sonship" (ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν). Hansen comments that according to Paul, "We could do nothing to attain to the position of sons and daughters; we can only receive the gift of adoption."[156] Thus the metaphor highlights that it is entirely the action of the Son that brings about the deliverance of those ὑπὸ νόμον.

Moreover, as advocates of the New Perspective claim, if "works of the law" refers to the established boundary markers around the Jews as an ethnic people, then

---

[151] Dunn, *Galatians*, 216.
[152] *TDNT*, 2:261.
[153] BDAG, 259.
[154] Martyn, *Galatians*, 271.
[155] See especially Stephen Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The Lutheran Paul and His Critics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 22-41, 297-340.
[156] G. Walter Hansen, *Galatians* (IVP New Testament Commentary Series, Downers Grove: IVP 2004), 120.

the υἱοθεσία metaphor is highlighting other key elements as well.[157] Given Paul's wording in verses 4-5 and his choice of υἱοθεσία, there is little question that he desires to emphasize that sonship is bestowed at the initiative of the Father through the mission of the Son. If, as advocates of the New Perspective argue, the works of the law are boundary markers, then the cognitive framework created by υἱοθεσία highlights for Paul's audience that God has bypassed ethnic boundaries to make sons apart from any ethnic ties. If this is the case, then Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor might also highlight that sonship is bestowed by the will of the Father and not inherited through ethnicity or through keeping the Law as a member of the covenant community. In support of this point Martyn argues, "[T]his corporate people is determined to no degree at all by the religious and ethnic factors that characterized the old creation," but rather "is determined solely by incorporation into the Christ in whom those factors have no real existence."[158] Martyn's point regarding ethnicity needs to be tempered slightly as υἱοθεσία as a model does not connote the obliteration of ethnic distinctions,[159] but it does render them no longer salient, and subordinates them to the new familial relationships created through adoption. Therefore, rather than asserting that ethnicity plays no factor, I would argue that Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor highlights the sufficiency of Christ to bring about adoption over and against ethnic barriers.

If the metaphor draws attention to the sufficiency of the Son's mission and the Father's initiation of a relationship with the believers, then by extension it hides any notion that sonship comes through Abraham and law observance. Presumably the agitators were preaching law observance as a stipulation of belonging to Abraham's descendants,[160] and already in Galatians 3 Paul subverts ethnic connections to Abraham by arguing that the sons of Abraham are οἱ ἐκ πίστεως (3:7). This phrase is sometimes treated as equivalent to οἱ πιστεύοντες, or as Schlier explains, "οἱ ἐκ πίστεως hat einen umfassenden Sinn: es sind die Menschen, die in der πίστις die

[157] See N. T. Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013), vol. 1, 354-75; James D. G. Dunn, *The New Perspective on Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 121-40, 213-226, 381-94, 413-28; see also N. T. Wright, *Paul: In Fresh Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 21-39.
[158] Martyn, *Galatians*, 382.
[159] See sections 3.2 and 3.3 of chapter 4 for discussion on the relationship between Greek and Roman adoption and previous familial and ethnic ties.
[160] See Longenecker, *Galatians*, 113-14; Martyn, *Galatians*, 302-306.

Grundweise ihres Lebens haben, deren Lebensprinzip die Pistis ist,"[161] which is to say that πίστις is a religious disposition. However, Hays argues that, in addition to being a religious disposition, the designation οἱ ἐκ πίστεως indicates "a particular group of people—for whom he invents the designation οἱ ἐκ πίστεως—are Abraham's 'sons' and therefore share in the blessing that Abraham received" on account of their participation in Christ.[162] Moreover, the gentile Galatians do not receive this blessing because they have faith "like faithful Abraham," but because they have been incorporated into the singular "seed" of Abraham, which is Christ (3:16). Hendrikus Boers remarks, "Christians, thus, have no direct relationship to Abraham. Their relationship to him is dependent on their belonging to Christ."[163] Similarly, James Dunn remarks, "Paul's point is precisely that the Galatian believers by sharing in Christ's sonship (iv.6-7) share also in the sonship of Abraham (iii.29); or rather, that they share not only in the lesser sonship of Abraham but even in the sonship of the Christ."[164] By reversing the "expected order" presumably promulgated by the agitators from the "sons of Abraham" being the "sons of God," to the "sons of God through faith" (3:26) who "belong to Christ" sharing also in the designation "seed of Abraham" (3:29), the metaphor highlights the primacy of the believers' sonship through God and hides any ethnic undertones in Abrahamic sonship.

Moreover, further undermining the agitators' message, the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians bypasses Abraham altogether by directly linking the believers' sonship to the Father's adoption of them. Hodge argues, "By the incorporation of Christ's spirit in their bodies, the gentiles inherit his ancestry."[165] Although I would argue that Paul includes both Jewish and Gentile believers in his υἱοθεσία metaphor, Hodge's point still stands; the believers have been directly incorporated into the ancestry of Christ through their adoption. Thus the cognitive framework constructed by the υἱοθεσία metaphor brings the actions of the Father, Son, and Spirit to the forefront of the mind while hiding the Jewish paradigm of sonship coming through Abraham and law

---

[161] Heinrich Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater* (KEK 7, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 128.
[162] Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 172; see also Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 79-91.
[163] Hendrikus Boers, *Theology Out of the Ghetto: A New Testament Exegetical Study Concerning Religious Exclusiveness* (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 81. N. b. Boers maintains that Abraham's faith is, in some sense, faith in Christ. I side more with Richard Hays who sees τῷ πιστῷ Ἀβραάμ as foreshadowing πίστις Χριστοῦ who is the "one heir of the promise" (*Faith of Jesus Christ*, 180).
[164] Dunn, *Galatians*, 214.
[165] Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 76.

observance. As Becker observes, Paul's illustrations here are not random, "sondern ist konstitutiv für die Polemik gegen die Irrlehrer."[166] Furthermore, Paul's negative portrayal of the law as an enslaving element, and specifying that the Son was sent ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ further distances sonship from law observance. Thus Paul uses the υἱοθεσία metaphor in conjunction with the portrayal of the law as an enslaving power to create the perception that sonship comes upon redemption *from* the law as an enslaving power, and that the sons of God are sons through their adoption by the Father, who makes them heirs *through* God apart from law observance.

3.3 Metaphor and Emotion

In chapter 3 I argued that metaphors not only affect cognition by subtly influencing the perception of their hearers or readers, but they also have the potential to arouse emotional responses from their audience, particularly when the metaphor is both emphatic and resonant. Ted Cohen observes that the real aim of a metaphor-maker is not to alter the way his or her audience *thinks* about a particular subject, but rather to alter the way he or she *feels* about a particular subject.[167] Indeed, the affective potential of a metaphor is equally important as its cognitive content in respect to its ability to create a particular vision of its subject. Therefore, in the exegesis of the metaphor in Galatians 4:5, one must consider what affective or emotional responses Paul is aiming to stimulate from his audience members through his υἱοθεσία metaphor. I argued in chapter 2 that persuasive metaphors achieve this by functioning as mini-narratives that draw their readers/hearers into them as participants in their stories.[168] As participants, the audience identifies with the characters and their attendant emotions. Thus below I will trace the contours of the narrative world Paul invites his readers/hearers to enter, and identify several of the most prominent emotions that he invites his readers to experience. Within the text, these emotions will be identified using Kövecses' root metaphors of emotion which I will show to underlie Paul's narrative in Galatians 4:1-7.

---

[166] Becker, "Der Brief and die Galater," 47.
[167] Cohen, *Thinking of Others*, 23.
[168] See section 2.2 of chapter 3.

However, it is also important to note that Paul's example in Galatians 4:1-7 is not terribly fraught with emotionally charged language,[169] nor is his exposition of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in 4:5 as laden with emotion as its parallel expression in Romans 8:15, where the frame of the metaphor is arguably much more emotionally charged.[170] Paul's tone in 4:4-5, which, if not taken from another source, is at least reminiscent of a creed,[171] perhaps does not lend itself as naturally to emotional expression, though the image of υἱοθεσία certainly communicates intimacy and belonging. Moreover, unlike Romans 8:15 where the believer is the subject of the emotional exclamation αββα ὁ πατήρ, in Galatians 4:5 the Spirit is the one who cries out and proclaims the believer's identity. I would suggest that Paul's attribution of the '*abbā* cry to the Spirit in Galatians 4:5 was intentional and strategic as it connects the believers' sonship directly to the testimony of the Spirit, but I also must acknowledge this same attribution possibly lessens the emotional response of the audience since their hearts are not the subjects of the verb.

Although the verses in Galatians 4:1-7 are not laden with emotionally charged language, they do present a detailed narrative world to the audience members. Moreover, in a few short verses the audience is presented with several complex characters that provide avenues through which the audience members participate in the narrative and experience emotion. These characters include: the minor son, the slave, the Father, the Son, and the Spirit. Paul's example in verses 1-2 invites his audience to view themselves as the minor son of the Father who is kept in the custody of guardians and overseers (ἐπιτρόπους καὶ οἰκονόμους). Moreover, the audience members are told that this son is "no different than a slave (οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου)." The audience members' identification with the character of the minor son is then explicitly reinforced by Paul's statement "so also we, when we were minors, were enslaved under the elements of the world (οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὅτε ἦμεν νήπιοι, ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἤμεθα δεδουλωμένοι)." Here the minor son and the slave blend together, and the audience is invited to view themselves as both slaves and minor sons being held in custody and existing in a state of slavery. Thus, the narrative world into which Paul invites his audience is one where the audience members exist both as

---

[169] See Longenecker, *Galatians*, 173-75

[170] This will be argued in detail in the following chapter which treats the two υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8:15 and 23..

[171] See section 1.3 above.

minor sons under the guardianship of guardians and overseers, and one in which they are enslaved to the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου.

Into this world of slavery, the Father initiates a plan of redemption. The character of the Father is present as a careful planner who has orchestrated the plan of redemption for his sons and heirs (ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμίας). In order to bring the minor son/slaves out of their state of slavery, the Father sends his Son into the same state of slavery. Thus Paul's audience is moved to recognize the Father's "beneficially invasive presence and activity whereby God liberates human beings from slavery."[172] Moreover, when the audience participates in the narrative through the character of the Father, they likely experience the narrative from the perspective of the Father's sacrifice and loss, and therefore they might appreciate the Father's great expense to redeem the minor sons/slaves.

The character of the Son is portrayed as an obedient agent who carries out his Father's will. He willingly enters into the same state of slavery as the minor sons and slaves of verses 1-2, taking on the full weight of both humanity and the law (γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον). In this respect, the Son, as Longenecker remarks, "is the culmination and focus of all of God's redemptive activity on behalf of humanity."[173] According to the text, the Son is purposeful in his mission to redeem the enslaved, so that the former slaves might receive the adoption to sonship and be counted as sons alongside the Son. Viewed from the perspective of the Son, in addition to the audience experiencing the feelings of self-sacrifice, the perspective of the Son also brings the dire situation of the minor sons/slaves into sharp relief. Indeed, the slaves and minor sons are so thoroughly entrenched in their position of slavery that only the Son's successful mission can bring about their redemption. Moreover, it is likely that Paul's audience would have identified closely with the sacrificial mission of the Son since Paul has already called them to be crucified with Christ (2:19), and be baptized with Christ, and to clothe themselves with Christ (3:27).

The character of the Spirit plays a supporting role in the narrative, and is only mentioned explicitly in verse 6. The primary role of the Spirit is to testify to the success of the Son's mission and to the new identity of the slaves/minor sons.

---

[172] De Boer, *Galatians*, 266.
[173] Longenecker, *Galatians*, 170.

Longenecker remarks that the purpose of the Spirit is "to witness to the filial relation of the believer with God that has been established by the work of Christ—a witness both to the believer (so 3:2, 5) and to God the Father (so here [in 4:6])."[174] However, I would argue that Longenecker inserts a false dichotomy into the role of the Spirit in 3:2-5 and 4:6. Although the Spirit is testifying to the Father in 4:6, as participants in the narrative Paul's audience also witnesses the Spirit's testimony of their filial relationship with the Father, even though the testimony is not directed toward them. Moreover, the Spirit's testimony is not a dry and legal declaration, but the emotive cry ''*abbā*, Father.' According to Booth's argument, the emotive cry of the Spirit becomes the emotive cry of Paul's audience as they identify with the Spirit in the narrative and experience his attendant emotions. Moreover, in the context of the narrative in Galatians 4:1-7 the emotive cry of the Spirit is particularly poignant for the audience members, who would have likely recognized that it is their own sonship which has lead to this emotive declaration by the Spirit.

In addition to the narrative of Galatians 4:1-7 inviting the audience to experience the attendant emotions of its various characters, Paul's argument in these verses draws upon several of the root metaphors of emotion identified by Kövecses. The primary root metaphor that Paul's argument utilizes to communicate emotional content is, "EMOTIONAL RELATIONSHIP IS A DISTANCE BETWEEN TWO ENTITIES,"[175] which propels the narrative throughout verses 1-7 as the distance between the sons and the Father gradually diminishes. In verses 1-2, although the minor son is a member of the Father's household, his access to the Father is mediated through the guardians and overseers, which implies that the son and Father do not enjoy an intimate or close emotional relationship. This implication is further confirmed by Paul's assertion that the minor son is "no different from a slave," which here underscores the distance between Father and son. Paul then describes the Father's redemptive action as action toward the enslaved sons, which is carried out by his Son. This action toward the enslaved sons (ἐξαποστέλλω in vv. 4 and 6) combined with the Son's act to bring about redemption from the state of slavery (ἐξαγοράζω) communicates that the Father's actions have decreased the distance between the Father and his sons, which is further evidenced by the sons' receiving their adoption

[174] Ibid., 174.
[175] Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion*, 92-93.

to sonship (υἱοθεσία). Thus the distance between two entities (i.e. the Father and his sons) has been decreased through the mission of the Son, implying that the Son's mission brought the adopted sons into greater relational and emotional closeness with the Father. The trajectory of relational distance to relational closeness is then succinctly summarized in verse 7, where Paul shows the audience that they have moved from slaves (δοῦλος) to sons and heirs (υἱός and κληρονόμος).

The narrative's trajectory of relational distance to relational and emotional closeness is further evidenced by the root metaphors that underlie the Spirit's declaration of sonship in verse 6. Significantly, the Spirit cries out from within the heart of the believer, which draws upon one of Kövecses' most basic root metaphors, "IMPORTANT IS CENTRAL."[176] Buscemi remarks, "[N]el N.T., in genere indica il centro o la sede della vita interiore, dove trovano origine tutte le forze e funzioni psichiche e spirituali,"[177] and in Galatians 4:6 specifically, the heart "indica soprattutto l'intimo dell'uomo, a cui Dio si rivolge mediante la missione dello Spirito...Esso agisce, allora, nei nostri cuori, divenendo principio intimo della nostra figliolanza divina."[178] Thus the heart, which the NT denotes the innermost part of a person, and more specifically the center of the person's will and resolve (e.g. Luke 21:14; 2 Cor 9:7) , the source of understanding, reflection and moral conduct (e.g. Mark 7:21; Matt 12:34; Acts 7:23), and the seat of feelings, passions, and emotions (e.g. John 14:1, 16:22; Rom 1:24; Jas 3:14),[179] is the seat of the Spirit's declaration of sonship. This is not to say that the declaration of sonship is purely an emotional outburst, but rather to point out that the location of the declaration of sonship (the heart) emphasizes the importance of the '*abbā* cry in the believers' experience of sonship.

Coupled with the importance of the Spirit's declaration coming from the heart of the believer, the relational closeness of the believer, the Spirit, and the Father is emphasized through the root metaphor "COMMUNICATION BETWEEN INTIMATES IS SHARING ONE'S INNERMOST OBJECTS."[180] The message of the Spirit seated in the heart of the believer communicates a relationship of emotional closeness by drawing upon

---

[176] Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion*, 90.
[177] "In the New Testament, it generally indicates the center or the place of the interior life, where all psychological and spiritual forces find their origin."
[178] "[the heart] primarily indicates the intimate part of man, to which God appeals through the mission of the Spirit…it thus acts in our hearts, becoming the intimate principle of our divine sonship" (Buscemi, "Liberta' e Huiothesia," 107).
[179] *TDNT*, 3:612-13.
[180] Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion*, 91.

the innermost part of the believer: his or her heart. Moreover, according to Kövecses the innermost physical parts of a person (in this case the heart) are identified with the person's true or real self. Kövecses argues, "[W]hen the deepest, innermost experiences are shared, the real, true self is shared."[181] Thus by placing the Spirit's declaration within the heart of the believers, Paul is communicating that their truest selves are communicated in the Spirit's declaration of sonship.

Furthermore, Paul's use of the verb κράζω draws upon the root metaphor "EMOTION IS A SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER."[182] Under Kövecses' understanding of emotion, Paul's description of the Spirit's cry coming from the heart of the believers communicates that this cry is an emotional outburst that wells up and overflows from the body which, as a container, can no longer contain the emotion. Once again, this is not necessarily to say that the Spirit's cry is an ecstatic or charismatic experience, but that the language and root metaphors in the text communicate that the cry of the Spirit is an emotionally intimate response that comes from the innermost part of the believer.

Despite the fact that the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 is not overtly charged or emotional language, there are many elements of the metaphor that would certainly have elicited an emotional response from Paul's audience. I argued earlier that Paul and his Galatian audience recognize their mutually shared common ground of receiving and experiencing the Spirit, and thus the υἱοθεσία metaphor is Paul's supplied cognitive framework through which his audience perceives and interprets that experience.[183] Fowl also argues this point stating, "If the Galatians already had seen their experience of the Spirit in this light, then they would never have been in the danger Paul imputes to them."[184] It is also likely that the Galatian audience's experience of the Spirit was accompanied by a particular set of attendant emotions. As Fee remarks, "[Paul's] entire argument comes aground if this appeal is not also to a reception of the Spirit that was dynamically experienced."[185] Thus in using υἱοθεσία as a metaphor to shape the audience's perception of the experience of the Spirit, Paul also attaches the cognitive framework of υἱοθεσία to the *attendant emotions* of that

---

[181] Ibid.
[182] Ibid., 65, 136.
[183] Betz, *Galatians*, 210.
[184] Fowl, "Who Can Read Abraham's Story," 83-84.
[185] Fee, *Galatians*, 106.

experience. Moreover, Paul's narrative in Galatians 4:1-7 invites his audience to participate with the characters and to experience their attendant emotions. The cognitive framework Paul attaches to their experience of the Spirit is a narrative designed to communicate a trajectory from emotional and relational distance to relational and emotional intimacy between the Father and his adopted sons. He identifies these attendant emotions with the Spirit's testimony of filial and familial intimacy as evidenced in the Spirit's '*abbā* cry which comes from the heart of the believers, and in his declaration that the Galatian believers have moved from slaves to sons and heirs (Gal 4:5-7). Furthermore, by grounding the υἱοθεσία metaphor in the Galatians' experience of the Spirit he connects these attendant emotions not only to the activity of the Spirit, but also to the activity of the Father and the Son. As Dunn states, "the Spirit of the Son prays the prayer of the Son and so attests the sonship of those who thus pray."[186] Thus Paul invokes their shared experience of the Spirit as common ground in order to arouse the *subjective* feelings of intimacy and belonging that are latent in the narrative surrounding the υἱοθεσία metaphor.

3.4 Metaphor and Community

As I argued in chapter 3, when metaphors are used within a particular speech community they often serve as a tool for reinforcing group identity through the cultivation of intimacy and the erection of boundaries. I also noted Cohen's argument that if metaphor-makers are successful, then they will cultivate a "sameness of vision" between themselves and those who share in the metaphor.[187] Conversely, the metaphor will erect boundaries for those who are unable to understand the metaphor and thus are unable to participate in the speech community.[188] Therefore, metaphors have the potential to create and undergird the identity of a particular group or community[189] through the cultivation of intimacy and the establishment of common ground and group boundaries. In Galatians 4:5 the υἱοθεσία metaphor creates intimate bonds between the author and audience who share in a particular understanding of the mode of entrance into sonship—namely, that sonship comes through adoption and not through lineage and law observance. The metaphor also creates community identity

[186] Dunn, *Galatians*, 222.
[187] Cohen, *Thinking of Others*, 22.
[188] Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 12.
[189] Gibbs, *The Poetics of Mind*, 192.

around the actions of the Father, Son, and Spirit that have bound the Galatians together as sons of God, and creates barriers against the agitators who have disseminated a contrary message of sonship.

3.4.1 Metaphor and the Cultivation of Intimacy

In chapter three I discussed the possibility of a metaphor creating intimacy between authors and their audiences, and also between audience members. This intimacy is primarily derived from the recognition of a shared "sameness of vision" of a particular subject. In Galatians 4:5 the primary cultivation of intimacy is between the author and audience, which Paul attempts to create through a shared understanding of *how* sonship of God is achieved. Conversely, the intimacy cultivated between audience members is somewhat difficult to gauge because the shifting pronouns do not clearly establish the community whom Paul addresses,[190] which may have diminished the ability of the Galatian audience to identify their intimate bonds with other members of the community. However, this is somewhat countered by Paul's appeal to the community's experience of the Spirit, which Paul uses to ground his υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5.[191] Above I argued that Paul's primary achievement in using υἱοθεσία as a metaphor to shape the believers' perception of their entrance into relationship with the Father was to emphasize the primacy of the Father's initiative over and against a sonship that is through law observance or physical descent from Abraham.[192]

If Paul is successful in persuading his audience to share in his "sameness of vision," he is also successful in cultivating an intimate bond between himself and his audience members as those who understand sonship as coming from God through *adoption* rather than through law observance.[193] Martyn argues that the agitators ("Teachers" according to Martyn) "seem also to be speaking at some length about the 'blessing of Abraham,' indicating that when God blessed the patriarch, he did so in such a way as eventually to bless those Gentiles who, by circumcision and Law observance, become 'Abraham's true descendants.'"[194] If Martyn is correct, then Paul's task is to persuade the Galatians of his own version of sonship by adoption,

---

[191] See section 1.3 above for a fuller discussion.
[192] See also sections 3.1 and 3.3 above.
[193] See also Cohen, "Some Philosophy," 30.
[194] Martyn, *Galatians*, 125.

which is in direct conflict with the message of the agitators. This is precisely what Paul aims to achieve in Galatians 3—4, where, as Daniel Boyarin observes, Paul "spiritualizes and allegorizes the notion of kinship. If, for rabbinic Jews the crucial signifier is actual, physical descent from Abraham, for Paul it is entry into the faith community of Christ which constitutes descent from Abraham, according to the Spirit."[195] Moreover, Paul's success in achieving a "sameness of vision" and cultivating intimacy goes beyond the audience grasping the cognitive content of his υἱοθεσία metaphor and his version of Abrahamic descent. Rather, Paul's success is dependent on the social function of his metaphor to cultivate a shared social bond that solidifies the community in Galatia as those who have believed Paul and his message of the gospel.[196]

If Paul succeeded in cultivating an intimate bond with his audience members, then it is possible too that these audience members also recognized that they share this common bond of understanding with each other. As Gibbs argues, metaphors often rely on the "exploitation of the context of shared beliefs held by speakers and listeners" [197] to communicate meanings that are social in addition to being propositional. Therefore, if Paul was successful in creating a "sameness of vision," then his υἱοθεσία metaphor potentially caused the members of the Galatian community to identify that they share together an understanding of themselves as sons adopted by the Father through the mission of the Son. This communal recognition of a shared "sameness of vision" produces feeling of intimacy between group members, and also potentially produces feelings of exclusion toward those whose message differed from Paul's. Burke argues that the υἱοθεσία metaphor effected the "resocialization" of believers who may have experienced "sharp displacement which many converts would have undergone because it [conversion] brought about a radical change in relationships."[198] Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor filters this experience of resocialization through the framework of adoption thereby creating an intimate bond between audience members that is founded both upon the shared experience of

[195] Daniel Boyarin, "Was Paul an 'Anti-Semite?': A Reading of Galatians 3-4," *USQR* 47 (1993): 54.
[196] In this way, the social function of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 seems to fit well with Paul's overall aim of presenting himself and his gospel as the true and trustworthy message of Christ (e.g. 1:1, 6-9, 11-12; 2:4-9; 4:12-20).
[197] Gibbs, *The Poetics of Mind*, 135-36.
[198] Burke, "Adopted as Sons," 275.

resocialization and their shared understanding of this experience as a direct result of their transference into a new family through their adoption.

A final observation regarding the cultivation of intimacy is that Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor creates the perception of an intimate bond between the believer and all three members of the Trinity. From Paul's perspective, the Father, Son, and Spirit not only share in a "sameness of vision" regarding the believer's adoption, but they are the active agents in accomplishing it. As Hansen states, "We could do nothing to produce an experience as sons and daughters; the action of God in sending the Spirit of his Son into our hearts enables us to enjoy our new relationship with God our Father."[199] Moreover, the Spirit's intimate cry of αββα ὁ πατήρ cultivates a sense of belonging, creating a kind of "insider knowledge" surrounding the believer's subjective experience of adoption.[200] As Fee states, "[God] has sealed that relationship by giving to us the language of his Son, the language of personal relationship."[201] The believer's perception of this intimate bond with the Trinity functions to undergird both his or her own identity rooted firmly in the adoption to sonship extended by the Father, but also cultivates intimacy between members of the community as they understand and participate in communal life as the adopted sons of God.

3.4.2 Metaphor and the Creation of Community Identity

There is little question that one of Paul's primary aims in Galatians is to create a strong sense of community identity for his Galatian audience that centers on the work of Christ and the experience of the Spirit rather than the works of the law. For Paul it is imperative that the Galatian gentiles recognize that the foundation of their identity is God's extension of sonship apart from works of the law. In regard to the υἱοθεσία metaphor in particular, Paul creates a new identity for his gentile audience members as sons and heirs of God. Indeed, in Galatians 4 Paul is bypassing Abraham entirely to state in emphatic terms that it is the Son, under the direction of the Father, who has redeemed the slaves and brought them into sonship through adoption, to which the Spirit testifies.

---

[199] Hansen, *Galatians*, 120.
[200] See the discussion on metaphor and community in section 3 of chapter 3; see also Clark, *Using Language*, 110.
[201] Fee, *Galatians*, 156.

Moreover, Paul's re-construal of sonship was possible because, in contradistinction to the agitators' message, "Paul was not confined to a core ethnic sentiment in his approach to identity construction, he was free to recreate a tradition favorable to Gentile members of the community."[202] What is fascinating about Paul's use of υἱοθεσία in Galatians 4 is that he also is able to attach Abraham's lineage to the gentile believers. Key to the reformation of community identity is the cognitive framework of υἱοθεσία that communicates sonship as *bestowed* rather than inherited or attained by law observance. Walters argues that in Galatians 4:1-7 Paul moves "to declare divine adoptive sonship more fundamental than descent from Abraham,"[203] and uses adoption and inheritance language "to dissolve distinctions between Jews and Gentiles: faith, not circumcision or Law-keeping, makes one an heir of Abraham."[204] Thus in the framework of υἱοθεσία those who do not keep the law nor trace their biological lineage to Abraham are still counted among Abraham's descendants because of their *adoption* by God. Through the cognitive framework of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 Paul makes quite clear that the gentiles, who were once outsiders and slaves, have been brought into community as adopted sons by God; God has decreed both family and inheritance for those who were historically excluded from the promise to Abraham.

A key component of the impact of the υἱοθεσία metaphor on the formation of community identity is its appeal and connection to the Galatians' experience of the Spirit. As Clark remarks, linguists regard this type of experience as the "ultimate insider information,"[205] and by appealing to this shared experience and overlaying it with the particular framework of υἱοθεσία, Paul draws a boundary around the Galatian believers as those who belong to the particular subgroup of "adopted sons of God," who share the common experience of the Spirit.[206] However, the shared experience of the Spirit is not in itself enough to solidify the Galatians' community identity as sons of God and descendants of Abraham."[207] Rather, Paul must put forth his own interpretation of the significance of their experience – namely, that the experience of the Spirit is demonstrable proof of their adoption by the Father through the Son.

---

[202] Asano, *Community-Identity Construction*, 227.
[203] Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," 65.
[204] Ibid., 66.
[205] Clark, *Using Language*, 110.
[206] Gibbs, *The Poetics of Mind*, 136.
[207] See also Fowl, "Who Can Read Abraham's Story," 83-84.

Paul's construal of sonship as bestowed by God upon οἱ ἐκ πίστεως through the faithful action of the Son creates a powerful symbol of community identity centered on Christ's successful mission of redemption and adoption. In this way, the υἱοθεσία metaphor goes beyond simply illuminating the boundaries between the Galatian believers and the message of the agitators but rather is strategic in forming and securing the boundaries around the community as they participate in Paul's understanding of sonship.[208] In contradistinction to the message of Paul's opponents, who presumably were eager to persuade the Galatian gentiles to adopt practices consistent with Jewish identity, through υἱοθεσία Paul is able to communicate a high level of belonging and community identity to those whom he urges to remain non-law-observant. Furthermore, Paul roots this new self-understanding of sonship through adoption in the objective experience of the Spirit, providing a strong proof for the Galatians that Paul's version of sonship yields the correct understanding of their identity as believers.

4. Conclusion

Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 occurs in the context of a passage rich in imagery and theological depth. Although the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 is typically described as a "soteriological" metaphor, I have argued above that it is more precise to construe the metaphor as "speaking about God's mission to bring believers into relationship with himself in terms which are seen to be suggestive of adoption." This construal of the metaphor undoubtedly speaks to similar theological concerns as the soteriological paradigm more commonly used for the framework of inquiry for the υἱοθεσία metaphor, however it also draws attention to the specific vocabulary (ἐξαποστέλλω, ἐξαγοράζω) found in the metaphor's immediate context. The immediate context of the metaphor also contributes to its potency and potential to actively and creatively form and influence the Galatian believers' perception of themselves and of the agitators' message. Although Paul draws upon some common images of a Roman household, he subtly subverts these images and includes elements that are surprising (e.g. ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρός, ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν), which draws emphatic attention to Paul's unique construal of sonship and inheritance.

---

[208] Zhang, "Corporate Identity Metaphor," 388.

Crucial to bridging the gap between the text and the metaphor's impact on the perceptions, emotions, and identity of the community members is Paul's move to ground the υἱοθεσία metaphor in the believers' experience of the Spirit. As Susann Liubinskas argues, "given that adoption and reception of the Spirit coincide, it is life in the Spirit which identifies the people of God."[209] Paul appeals to the Galatians' common experience of the Spirit as his evidence of the success of the Son's mission to bring about their adoption to sonship. Over and against the agitators' message that sonship of God comes through Abraham and law observance, Paul urges the believers to instead view their sonship through his proposed lens of adoption. Moreover, the υἱοθεσία metaphor draws attention to the intimate bonds both between Paul and his audience, and between the audience members and the Triune God who has effected their adoption. Read through this framework, Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 demonstrates the affective and performative qualities that metaphors possess, which an author may use to solidify the common ground between themselves and members of the community of their addressees.

[209] Susann Liubinskas, "Identification by Spirit Alone: Community-Identity Construction in Galatians 3:19-4:7," *AsTJ* 67.1 (2012): 35.

VI. WE OURSELVES GROAN INWARDLY: THE ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ METAPHORS IN ROMANS 8:15 AND 23

1. Introduction

The υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 occur as a part of one of Paul's richest expositions of the Christian life, which is lived out as believers are caught "in between" the ages. Indeed, the tension between the Pauline "already" and "not yet" comprises an integral part of both expressions of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in this chapter. Although there is sometimes a tendency to focus the interpretive task on resolving this tension,[1] the multivalent nature of metaphor should caution us away from explanations that do not allow both metaphors to speak with their own voices.[2] In contrast, the methodology I have proposed for reading the υἱοθεσία metaphors will appreciate the tension created by the polyphonous voices of the two υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8. I will proceed with the same two major divisions as in the previous chapter: the first section (Metaphor and Text) focusing on the literary aspects of each metaphor, and the second (Metaphor and Audience) focusing on the possible cognitive framework, intimacy, and identity created by each metaphor. To appreciate the unique voice of each υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 8 the first section (Metaphor and Text) of this chapter will treat each metaphor individually, and to best address the effect of the metaphors on cognition, emotion, and identity, the second (Metaphor and Audience) will synthesize the effects of both metaphors. Because Paul has used υἱοθεσία as a description for his audience of believers in Romans 8, my focus in this chapter will primarily address how the metaphor impacts their perception of and their emotional response to their relationship to God (Father, Son, and Spirit),

---

[1] For example, C. K. Barrett resolves the tension by translating Rom 8:15 "the Spirit which anticipates our adoption as sons" (*Epistle to the Romans* [BNTC, London: Adam & Charles Black, 1962], 163); C. E. B. Cranfield points to the phrase τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ and argues that υἱοθεσία in v. 23 refers to the manifestation and public proclamation of the sonship of believers (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* [ICC, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1990], vol. 1, 419); Douglas Moo simply states that Paul's portrayal of adoption in Romans 8 "can be pictured both as past and as future" (*The Epistle to the Romans* [NICNT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1996], 521); similarly, Thomas Schreiner states, "The problem is solved once one sees that adoption has an eschatological cast" (*Romans* [BECNT, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998], 439).

[2] Because I argued in the second chapter that the meaning of a metaphor occurs at the level of an utterance, and that changes to a metaphor's frame, tenor, and vehicle result in changes to the metaphor's meaning, I will speak of the two υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 rather than the "υἱοθεσία metaphor."

and to others in the community of believers. As such, it is intentionally an anthropocentric approach to the text, focused on the metaphors' cognitive and affective potential for Paul's Roman audience.

Because the methodology I will use for treating these texts raises questions quite different from some more theologically driven readings of Romans 8,[3] it is of no surprise that my treatment below will contain some slightly different emphases than readings driven by questions of Pneumatology or Christology. It must be said, then, at the outset that my intention is to offer this reading of the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 as a complementary reading to readings concerned with specific theological questions. However, just as in the exegesis of Galatians 4, I will refrain from treating υἱοθεσία in Romans 8 as a metaphor "for salvation,"[4] as the possible soteriological implications of υἱοθεσία are only some of the many entailments present in a truly robust reading of the metaphor.[5] If the analysis of υἱοθεσία is limited to an explanation of its soteriological significance, or to an account of its soteric benefits,[6] we risk, to some degree, impoverishing the richness of Paul's imagery in Romans 8. Thus in the analysis below I will seek to appreciate a wider array of possible implications for Paul's audience, especially in light of the inherent eschatological tension he presents to them in his two occurrences of υἱοθεσία in Romans 8.

1.1. Paul's Audience in Rome

Although most scholars agree on several points, such as that Paul is writing to a church which he did not evangelize, that the Jews were expelled from Rome under Claudius, and that there was likely a high degree of tension between Jews and Gentiles in the Roman Christian community, the precise demographics of Paul's audience in Romans remain a vigorously debated area of Pauline studies. Joseph

---

[3] Burke's work on Romans is an excellent example of theological readings born of careful and thorough exegesis; see especially *Adopted into God's Family*, 72-151, 177-197; see also David B. Garner, "Adoption in Christ" (Westminster Theological Seminary: Ph.D. Diss., 2002).

[4] For the trouble of speaking of something as "a metaphor for *x*" see sections 2.3.1 and 3.2 of chapter 2.

[5] For example, these metaphors in Romans 8 undoubtedly touch on personal and general eschatology, pneumatology, and ecclesiology, which will be evident from the analysis below.

[6] Studies driven by the theological significance of the υἱοθεσία metaphors tend to focus on their soteriological dimensions. This is not to say that the soteriological entailments of the metaphor are not important, but rather that the soteriological significance of the metaphor is only part of its overall meaning. For studies dealing with the soteriological significance see Trumper, "An Historical Study of the Doctrine of Adoption in the Calvinistic Tradition"; idem, "The Metaphorical Import of Adoption," 129-45; idem, "The Theological History of Adoption I: An Account," *SBET* 20 (2002): 4-28; idem, "The Theological History of Adoption II: A Rationale." *SBET* 20 (2002): 177-202; Garner, "Adoption in Christ."

Fitzmyer wisely states, "Part of the problem in trying to determine the Christian community to which Paul addresses his letter is that he writes to it with a certain ignorance."[7] An older and fading view among Pauline scholars is that the abundance of Old Testament references and the prominence of Paul's concerns about the Mosaic law indicate that Paul's audience was comprised of a majority, if not entirely, of Jewish Christians.[8] For example, Norbert Krieger states, "Beweisführung aus der Schrift wirklich nur jüdischen Lesern zumuten konnte."[9] Similarly Fahy argues, "The Romans, to whom this letter is addressed, were outside the sphere of his commission. They were Jews, as indicated by the internal evidence."[10] However, it is clear from Paul's letter to the Galatians that he feels free to include references to Jewish Scripture despite his addressees being predominantly of Gentile origin, and both the internal evidence (e.g. Rom 1:5; 1:13; 11:13; 15:14-19), and the external evidence for a mixed audience for Romans seems to argue against a predominantly Jewish makeup.[11]

On the other side of the spectrum, a reevaluation of the letter's internal evidence has led a growing number of scholars to see Romans as a letter written to an exclusively Gentile audience.[12] Most scholars who argue for a solely Gentile audience do so on the basis of the letter's internal evidence. For example, Hodge argues, "Paul never claims to be speaking to *Ioudaioi* in his letters, nor does he connect his own teaching activity with *Ioudaioi*….Therefore, I do not seek for evidence about historical communities, but for the ways Paul portrays his audience, how he creates

---

[7] Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans* (AB, New York: Doubleday, 1993), 33.
[8] See especially F. C. Baur, "Über Zweck und Veranlassung des Römerbriefes und die damit Zusammenhängenden Verhältnisse der römischen Gemeinde," in *Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben: Historisch-Kritische Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, vol. 1, ed. Klaus Scholder (Stuttgart: Friedrich Fromman, 1963), 147-266; H. Lietzmann, "Zwei Notizen zu Paulus," *SPAW* 8 (1930): 151-56.
[9] Norbert Krieger, "Zum Römerbrief," *NovT* 3.1 (1959): 148.
[10] T. Fahy, "St. Paul's Romans Were Jewish Converts," *ITQ* 26 (1959): 183.
[11] See especially Robert Jewett's thorough introduction (*Romans* [Hermeneia, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007, 46-75).
[12] E.g. William S. Campbell, "The Addressees of Paul's Letter to the Romans," in *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 171-95; Neil Elliott, *The Rhetoric of Romans: Argumentative Constraint and Strategy and Paul's Dialogue with Judaism* (JSNTSup 45, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990); Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*; Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*, 201-207; Mark Nanos, *The Mystery of Romans: The Jewish Context of Paul's Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 75-84; Idem., "The Jewish Context of the Gentile Audience Addressed in Paul's Letter to the Romans," *CBQ* 61.2 (1999): 283-304; Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans*.

their identity."[13] In addition, Johannes Munck points to external historical evidence to support his claim. Munck states, "While Paul has been the apostle to the Gentiles, Peter and the other Jewish apostles have gone on to preach to the Jews in the east. There is therefore no Jewish Christian mission in the Pauline mission fields."[14] Stanley Stowers eschews the possibility of recovering the "real audience" of Romans, but emphatically states, "I can know with certainty that the audience in the text is gentiles at Rome who know something about Jewish scripture and Jesus Christ."[15] However, although differentiating between the implied audience and the real audience of the letter may illuminate some of the text's rhetorical strategies, it might also be argued that the trouble with attempting to construct the historical audience of the letter "out of the text," without also considering the historical evidence for the ethnic makeup of the Roman church, makes it quite possible for an interpreter to construct an audience that fits his or her paradigm of exegesis best. There is little doubt that Romans was addressed to a primarily Gentile audience, but it is difficult to maintain that the makeup of the letter's audience was *exclusively* Gentile. Such claims seem more driven by an ideological framework regarding the status of the Jewish community than grounded in a sound method of historiography.[16]

With the majority of scholars,[17] I will proceed with the premise that Paul's audience was comprised primarily of Gentiles, though likely contained a number of Jews as well. Regarding the internal evidence, Paul, in his argument in Romans, seems particularly interested in the relations between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians (e.g. 1:16; 3:29-30; 4:11-12; 11:13-24) and questions of identity for both Jewish and Gentile members of the Christian community in Rome (e.g. 2:25-29; 9:6-13; 11:5-7). Furthermore, it is perhaps unlikely that Paul would feel the need to offer the aside "I am speaking to you, Gentiles," (Ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν) in Romans 11:13 if, in fact, he had been speaking to an entirely Gentile audience all along. In addition, it is highly likely, though not entirely certain, that Paul's discussion of the

[13] Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 9-11.
[14] Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*, 208.
[15] Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans*, 22.
[16] See also John Barclay's helpful critique of Stowers (review of *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles*, by Stanley Stowers, *JTS* 46.2 [1995]: 646-51).
[17] E.g. Barrett, *Romans*, 22; Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 1, 18; James D. G. Dunn, *Romans* (WBC, Dallas: Word Books, 1988), vol. 1, xlv; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 32-33; Jewett, *Romans*, 70-72; Moo, *Romans*, 12-13; Schreiner, *Romans*, 13.

"strong" and the "weak" in Romans 12 touches upon tensions that have arisen between Jews and Gentiles over dietary regulations.[18]

Regarding the external evidence, it is most likely that the church in Rome was evangelized by Jewish missionaries and had a strong Jewish presence, though the Jewish character of the churches was likely influenced by the expulsion of the Jews under Claudius.[19] For example, Prisca and Aquila are introduced in Acts 18 as Jewish believers who were forced to leave Italy under Claudius, suggesting that there was at least some presence of Jewish Christianity in Rome prior to Paul's letter arriving. James Dunn further remarks, "[K]nowledge of the OT within the ancient world was confined almost wholly to Jewish and Jewish-derived communities….[T]o be able to assume such a knowledge of the scriptures…he would have to assume that his readership by and large had enjoyed a substantial link with the synagogue."[20] In light, then, of both internal and corroborating external evidence, it is most likely that the audience to whom Paul addresses his letter is comprised of a majority of Gentiles and a minority of Jews.

1.2 Romans 8:15-23: Preliminary Exegetical Issues

Although the focus of this chapter will be on an interpretation of the two υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8:15-23, there are several initial exegetical decisions that must be made in order to situate the analysis of the metaphor within the larger context of Romans 8. Albeit numerous interpretational and exegetical conundrums exist in Romans 8, those most pertinent to the analysis of the υἱοθεσία metaphors are the connotation of σάρξ and πνεῦμα, the antecedent of ἐν ᾧ in verse 15, the translation of αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν, Paul's family map in Romans 8, and the textual variant in Romans 8:23. The origin and meaning of αββα ὁ πατήρ also figures significantly in the meaning of the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans

[18] This is not to say that the "strong" and the "weak" correspond precisely to the Gentile and Jewish believers, but rather to point out that the concerns Paul addresses seem to be over dietary laws. As Jewett remarks, "It is likely that the majority of the strong were Gentile believers, with Jewish liberals such as Paul and his close allies included in this group. It is also likely that the weak included Jewish adherents to the law, but this group probably included some Gentiles who had been close to synagogues before becoming believers" (*Romans*, 71).

[19] Dunn notes, "When the expulsion took place is a matter of some dispute….The best solution is probably to see two actions by Claudius in 41 and 49: the first an early palliative ruling, short-lived and limited in effect; the second more deliberate and drastic after his patience had worn out" (*Romans*, vol. 1, xlix).

[20] Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, l.

8, however it is likely that Paul uses the '*abbā* cry here in the same way he invokes it in Galatians 4:6.[21] The sense of the genitive υἱοθεσίας in verse 15 is also relevant to the interpretation of the metaphor, but the classification of the genitive is closely related to the tenor of the metaphor and so will be treated in detail below. In addition to these particular exegetical decisions, it is also necessary to establish the overall focus and tone of Romans 8 in order to analyze the impact that the two υἱοθεσία metaphors have on the text and the readers.

In order to situate the two υἱοθεσία metaphors within Romans 8, it is helpful here to establish how Romans 8 fits into the overall structure of the letter. Some commentaries treat Romans 8 as Paul's exposition of the believers' experience of life in the Spirit.[22] However, it is also possible to read Romans 8 on a more cosmic scale, focusing instead on the totality of God's redemptive actions.[23] Vincent Branick states, "Paul's task is rather to understand what God is doing for his creation, how God has overcome and is overcoming the powers of death in the universe."[24] Paul's description of the activity of the Father, Son, and Spirit in Romans 8, together with the presence of cosmic language and imagery, fits well within this paradigm of interpretation. Given also that the two instances of υἱοθεσία metaphors occur against the backdrop of this cosmic and apocalyptic imagery, a "cosmically oriented" reading seems all the more warranted. Therefore, while the exegesis below will appreciate the role of the Spirit in the Christian life, the starting point of interpretation will intentionally be on the cosmic scale of God's redemptive action, including especially the eschatological framework of the metaphor.

The meaning of σάρξ in the Pauline corpus is a thorny interpretive issue, and many translations are driven by theological concerns in addition to lexical evidence.[25] Moreover, the dichotomy of σάρξ and πνεῦμα in Romans 8:4-9 forms the heart of Paul's argument in these verses, and the implications of a life lived according to σάρξ and πνεῦμα are the central emphasis of verses 12-17. Although there are a few scholars who see σάρξ as possessing at least some degree of negative connotation in

---

[21] See section 1.3 of chapter 5 for a discussion on the origin and meaning of the '*abbā* cry.
[22] E.g. Moo, *Romans*, 467-537; Grant Osborne, *Romans* (IVP New Testament Commentary Downers Grove: IVP, 2004), 192-224; Schreiner, *Romans*, 395-447.
[23] See esp. Jewett, *Romans*, 474-530.
[24] Vincent P. Branick, "Apocalyptic Paul?," *CBQ* 47.4 (1985): 666.
[25] See e.g. I Howard Marshall's summary of the theological and lexical issues in his article "Living in the 'Flesh,'" *BSac* 159 (2002): 387-403.

every Pauline occurrence,[26] most interpreters acknowledge that Paul uses σάρξ in positive, neutral, and negative contexts.[27] However, regardless of whether positive connotations for σάρξ are present elsewhere in the Pauline corpus, its use in Romans 8 where it is consistently juxtaposed with πνεῦμα surely suggests a negative connotation for σάρξ in this passage. Indeed Schlier remarks, "[Das Fleisch] ist nicht nur Gott feindlich, sondern aktive Feindschaft gegen Gott."[28] The negative connotation of σάρξ in Romans 8 is fairly uncontroversial, but it is less clear if σάρξ and πνεῦμα are to be understood in terms of two contrasting ontologies,[29] two contrasting modes of behavior,[30] or possibly even epochs or realms of influence.[31] As I will now argue, in light of the cosmic and eschatological tone of Romans 8 as a whole, the last option seems to fit the contextual evidence best.

Although some argue that σάρξ and πνεῦμα represent two distinct ontological categories of people (believers and unbelievers), Dunn observes that it is unlikely that Paul "envisaged two classes of humankind, created differently and forever locked into a particular character and destiny."[32] Moreover, the υἱοθεσία metaphor in 8:15, which is closely linked to Paul's understanding of πνεῦμα, does not lend itself well to the ontological view, since adoption as a model connotes a change in position or relationship rather than a change in essence. However, reading σάρξ and πνεῦμα as moral categories minimizes the cosmic and eschatological language of Romans 8, and minimizes the significance of υἱοθεσία as a term of permanent transfer between κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες and κατὰ πνεῦμα [ὄντες]. The last view, which takes σάρξ and πνεῦμα as two contrasting epochs and realms of influence understands σάρξ to refer to two "occupying powers" which are engaged in an apocalyptic and eschatological battle.[33]

---

[26] See e.g. Elizabeth Gordon Edwards, "Exploring the Implications of Paul's Use of *Sarx* (Flesh)," in *Biblical Ethics & Homosexuality: Listening to Scripture*, ed. Robert Brawley (Louisville: WJK, 1996), 69-75; Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 13.

[27] See e.g. Marshall, "Living in the 'Flesh,'" 387-403; J. P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, eds., *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1988), xiv-xv; Wilber T. Dayton, "The New Testament Conception of Flesh," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 2.1 (1967): 7-17.

[28] Heinrich Schlier, *Der Römerbrief* (HTKNT, Freiburg: Herder, 1977), 245.

[29] E.g. Schreiner, *Romans*, 410-17; Moo, *Romans*, 486-87; Fitzmyer, *Romans,* 488; Jewett, *Romans*, 486.

[30] See esp. Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 424-30; Brendan Byrne, *Romans* (SP, Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996), 238-41.

[31] This view would be similar to Martyn's understanding of σάρξ and πνεῦμα in Galatians (Martyn, *Galatians*, 529-40).

[32] Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 425.

[33] See Martyn, *Galatians*, 530-31.

According to this view, those who exist κατὰ σάρκα and also have the mindset of the flesh (τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς) exist within the realm of the old age. In contrast, those who exist κατὰ πνεῦμα and have the mindset of the Spirit (τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος) have been, in some sense, transferred into the new eschatological age by virtue of their adoption and reception of the Spirit. However, since these two ages, in some sense, exist simultaneously, there is a high degree of tension between the σάρξ and the πνεῦμα, which is particularly evident in Paul's language in Romans 8:17-23 where all of creation groans awaiting the final outcome of the battle.

There are several significant grammatical issues to consider before moving into the analysis of the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8:15-23. The first is what the antecedent in the phrase ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν refers to, the personal πνεῦμα, or the impersonal "in that," which would refer to the entire experience of receiving the Spirit of adoption. Although some interpreters have pointed to the plural form of κράζομεν as an indication that Paul has envisaged this "crying out" as part of a baptismal ritual or a corporate worship setting,[34] the close proximity of πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας makes it a more likely antecedent for the relative pronoun.[35] Under this reading, the Spirit is the one who enables the believer to cry αββα ὁ πατήρ, and as Cranfield remarks, "'Abba' is represented as a result of the gift of the Spirit. That this is more consonant with Paul's thought as expressed elsewhere can scarcely be doubted."[36]

Another preliminary grammatical issue that relates to the role of the Spirit in the reception of υἱοθεσία is the classification of the dative and the Spirit's function in the phrase αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν. Cranfield suggests that συμμαρτυρεῖν and the dative τῷ πνεύματι should be understood as the Spirit testifying *to our spirit* rather than *with our spirit*. Cranfield argues, "what standing has our spirit in *this* matter? Of itself it surely has no right at all to testify to our being sons of God."[37] However, Cranfield's translation stretches the normal range of the σύν- prefix, which elsewhere in Romans 8 Paul clearly intends to mean "together with" (e.g. συγκληρονόμοι, συμπάσχομεν, and συνδοξασθῶμεν in v. 17). Rather, it is appropriate to understand συμμαρτυρεῖ in verse 15 as "bear witness with," where

[34] E.g. Jewett, *Romans*, 498-99; Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 272; see also the translation "When we cry, 'Abba, Father,'" in the NRSV.
[35] E.g. Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 452-53l; Barrett, *Romans*, 163-64.
[36] Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 1, 398-99.
[37] Ibid., 403.

"Paul involves our own spirit in the very process of testifying to us that we are 'children of God.'"[38]

Another preliminary point of contention is Paul's "family map" in Romans 8, where the believers are designated ἀδελφοί (v. 12) υἱοί (vv. 14, 19) τέκνα (vv. 16, 17, 21), κληρονόμοι and συγκληρονόμοι (v. 17), and later Christ is designated as πρωτότοκος "among many brothers and sisters" (ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς [v. 29]).[39] Aasgaard has expressed uncertainty that Christ's designation as "firstborn among many brothers and sisters" leads to the conclusion that Christians are siblings among themselves.[40] Rather he argues that Christians are co-siblings with Christ, although Christ is placed in "an elevated position,"[41] but that this does not emphasize the horizontal connections among Christians, and, in Aasgaard's view, "Rom. 8.29 cannot serve as a basis for a christological justification for Christian siblingship in general in Paul."[42] While Aasgaard may be correct in his assertion that the "family map" of Romans 8 is incomplete insofar as it does not draw an explicit connection between Christians as siblings of Christ and Christians as siblings with one another, his concerns regarding the *familia Dei* seem a bit too cautious. If metaphors by nature suggest models, and if Paul's metaphorical language in Romans 8 draws upon the model of a household, it is not unwarranted to conclude that Paul envisions these relationships (sibling, son, co-heir, brother) existing within the same household. Rather, the onus is on Aasgaard to demonstrate how kinship language in such close proximity could be mapped onto two *separate* referents: one of Christians as brothers and sisters (v. 12), and one of Christians as siblings of Christ (vv. 17, 29). Metaphors which draw upon the same model do not need to be harmonized fully within the text, as it is in the nature of metaphors to suggest their implications to their audience whereby the audience is able to harmonize the metaphors. Thus it is highly likely that

---

[38] Moo, *Romans*, 504; see also Schlier's wise remark, "In welcher Weise Paulus sich dieses συμμαρτυρεῖν des Geistes vollzogen denkt, ist nicht sicher zu sagen" (*Römerbrief*, 254).
[39] There is also a debate as to whether πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς is a pre-Pauline or Pauline addition to the "golden chain" in verse 29; see Aasgaard, *"My Beloved Brothers and Sisters,"* 140-41; Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 245-47. However, the manuscript tradition suggests a stable text and there is nothing much to be gained in debating whether the addition was pre-Pauline or Pauline. Moreover, Aasgaard's insistence that the addition signifies that "something is at stake," and that "v. 29bc serves to link it [the golden chain] with a christological aspect, and thus emphasize the role of Jesus" would also be true if the addition were pre-Pauline (*"My Beloved Brothers and Sisters,"* 140-41).
[40] Ibid., 145-49.
[41] Ibid., 146.
[42] Ibid., 148.

Paul's use of kinship terms in Romans 8 have strong vertical *and* horizontal implications.

The final preliminary issue that must be considered prior to the analysis of the υἱοθεσία metaphors is the textual variant in Romans 8:23 which omits the single word υἱοθεσίαν.[43] The manuscript evidence for the inclusion of υἱοθεσίαν in verse 23 is much stronger,[44] and Fitzmyer admits "it is difficult to explain how it got into the text of most of the other Greek MSS."[45] Metzger comments that υἱοθεσίαν was likely omitted because "copyists doubtless found [it] to be both clumsy in the context and dispensable, as well as seeming to contradict v 15."[46] The weight of the manuscript evidence and the *lectio difficilior* both weigh strongly for the inclusion of υἱοθεσίαν in verse 23, which emphasizes the tension between the now and the not-yet in the two iterations of υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8.

2. Metaphor and Text

2.1 The Metaphorical Utterance in Romans 8:15 and 8:23

Recall that rather than treating υἱοθεσία as a "metaphorical word," this study will operate under the premise that metaphorical meaning occurs at the level of a complete utterance.[47] In Romans 8:15 Paul's metaphorical utterance occurs as part of a well-developed and descriptive sequence of related metaphors utilizing imagery of slavery, adoption, and inheritance. Thus it is necessary not only to consider Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor individually, but also to consider how the metaphor relates to the other metaphors in the immediate context. As Douglas Campbell remarks, "those who are led by the Spirit…have been 'adopted' (8:15) and thus no longer possess the fearful minds of slaves but, rather, minds that cry 'Abba Father'. Furthermore, to be a son or a child is also to be an heir and to be destined for glory."[48] Since these themes

[43] P^{46vid} D F G 614.
[44] P^{46} ℵ A C 81, 1506, 1739, 1881.
[45] Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 510. N.b. Fitzmyer concludes that "it is preferably omitted" because of Paul's statement that believers have already been adopted in 8:15.
[46] Roger L. Omanson, *A Textual Guide to the Greek New Testament: An Adaptation of Bruce M. Metzger's Textual Commentary for the needs of Translators* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006), 304.
[47] For an explanation of metaphorical meaning see section 3.2 of chapter 2..
[48] Douglas Campbell, "The Story of Jesus in Romans and Galatians," in *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, ed. Bruce W. Longenecker (Louisville: WJK, 2002), 106.

are intertwined, the other concepts and metaphors inform Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor, and vice versa.

Within 8:15 there are two distinct but related metaphors that have the same referent:[49] the Holy Spirit. The first metaphor in 8:15 is posed in contrast to the υἱοθεσία metaphor: οὐ γὰρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας πάλιν εἰς φόβον. There are several interpretive options for the two "spirits" in verse 15,[50] but it is preferable to see the two metaphors Paul uses as a rhetorical negation and an affirmation predicated of the Holy Spirit.[51] The vehicle in the first metaphor is δουλεία, which acts as a foil for what Paul affirms about the Spirit in the υἱοθεσία metaphor that follows. There are two possible ways of construing the metaphorical utterance containing υἱοθεσία in Romans 8:15. The first is to restrict the metaphorical utterance to the clause in which υἱοθεσία occurs, rendering the utterance ἀλλ' ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας. This construal treats the last prepositional phrase of verse 15 as a (possibly non-metaphorical) modifier of τό πνεῦμα. Several analyses of verse 15 favor this option, such as the NRSV translation which inserts the temporal "when" into the verse translating verse 15 "when we cry, 'Abba! Father!'"[52] The more preferable option is to treat ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν· αββα ὁ πατήρ as an extension of the υἱοθεσία metaphor.[53] Burke describes the '*abbā* prayer as "a short ejaculatory or extemporaneous response-prayer emitted by the newly adopted son, as an awareness of newfound filial status in the family *Dei* strikes home."[54] Since the image of υἱοθεσία is naturally associated with other kinship terms, especially the images of ἀββᾶ and πατήρ, and since the act

---

[49] Soskice states, "[W]e conclude that the metaphorical vehicle is not used to pick out a second subject, or another referent, but to describe the referent picked out by the whole of the utterance, or more accurately, by the speaker in making the utterance" (*Metaphor and Religious Language*, 53).

[50] One option is to argue that these references describe the human spirit (e.g. William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 5th ed. [ICC, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902], 202-203). Dunn also notes that the two references could "reflect the current way of expressing opposition between God and evil in terms of good and evil spirits" (e.g. 1QS 3.18ff.; *T. Reub.* 5.3; *T. Sim.* 2.7; 3.1; 4.7; *T. Levi* 2.3; 9.9; 18.7, 11; *T. Jud*. 13.3; 14.2,8; 20.1) (*Romans*, vol. 1, 451). Another alternative is to see these spirits as a contrast between the two ages (E.g. Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 452).

[51] This position is held by Cranfield (*Romans*, vol. 1, 396); Fitzmyer (*Romans*, 499-500); Moo (*Romans*, 500-501), and Schreiner (*Romans*, 424-25).

[52] Interpreters who see this as either a baptismal rite or a worship situation might also distinguish the action of "receiving the Spirit of adoption" from the act of crying out "Abba! Father!" (e.g. Jewett, *Romans*, 498). See also Cranfield's helpful critique of the RSV translation that connects ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν αββα ὁ πατήρ to verse 16 (*Romans*, vol. 1, 398).

[53] This fits with the translation and interpretation of the majority of scholars (e.g. Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 1, 398-99; Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 452-53; Moo, *Romans*, 502-503; Osborne, *Romans*, 206-207; Schreiner, *Romans*, 425-26;

[54] Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*, 95.

of crying out to the Father is so closely associated with the believer's reception of the Spirit, it is best to understand the prepositional phrase as part of the υἱοθεσία metaphorical utterance in this context. Thus the metaphorical utterance in Romans 8:15 is: ἀλλ᾽ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν· αββα ὁ πατήρ.

Similar to the construction of verse 15, the metaphorical utterance containing υἱοθεσία in Romans 8:23 occurs in a short string of related metaphors, though they use slightly different vehicles from the sequence in verse 15 (ἀπαρχή, υἱοθεσία, and ἀπολύτρωσις). Here then, the complete metaphorical utterance containing υἱοθεσία occurs in the middle of the verse, in the clause ἡμεῖς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι. The υἱοθεσία metaphor is further modified by the opening clause of the verse, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες, which qualifies the tenor of the υἱοθεσία metaphor, clarifying that those longing for adoption are those who have the "firstfruits of the Spirit." This qualification limits the application of the υἱοθεσία metaphor to a specific type of person (those who have the Spirit), and also adds a temporal dimension to the metaphor by suggesting that the "firstfruits" were received in anticipation of a future event. James Dunn aptly remarks, "[T]he Spirit is the firstling of God's harvest; the one who has received the Spirit has been thus dedicated to God."[55] Dunn continues, "The gift of the Spirit reclaims the believer for God and begins or heightens the tension between human belonging to God and human entrancement with the world…the warfare between Spirit and flesh."[56] Dunn's assessment captures precisely the connection between the metaphor of the Spirit as the firstfruits and the υἱοθεσία metaphor, suggesting that the metaphorical utterance containing υἱοθεσία in verse 23 is directed at a particular experience (receiving the Spirit) with both a present and a future expectation (υἱοθεσία).

The final phrase, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν, is sometimes taken as a straightforward, epexegetical clarification of υἱοθεσία – namely, the final expression of adoption is evidenced by the redemption of the body.[57] This is understandable considering that the two metaphors form the two parts of a double

[55] James Dunn, "Spirit Speech: Reflections on Romans 8:12-27," in *Romans & the People of God*, eds. Sven K. Soderlund, and N. T. Wright (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 86.
[56] Ibid., 87.
[57] E.g. Burke remarks, "The last element in adoption is the 'redemption of our body' (v. 23) where the two phrases υἱοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι and τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν are related epexegetically and understood as one event" ("Adopted as Sons," 286).

accusative. However, it is problematic to assert that one metaphor "explains" another metaphor.[58] Each metaphor contributes its own vehicle and conjures its own set of entailments. Furthermore, interpreters often move from the Pauline metaphor of "redemption" to the act of resurrection as if the two were entirely synonymous. While there is no doubt that the "redemption of our bodies" for Paul entails resurrection, redemption implies a release from bondage and slavery that is missing in the literal term "resurrection."[59] Thus while it is certainly true that the twin metaphors of adoption and redemption complement each other, it is unsatisfactory to reduce "adoption" to "redemption," or vice versa. Each metaphor in this verse contributes something unique to the overall picture of God's saving action in the context of the whole of creation, and we must therefore carefully consider how these images relate to, or rather *explain*, each other. Thus in the analysis below we will treat ἡμεῖς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι, and τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν as two separate metaphors.

2.2. Models, Tenors, and Vehicles in Romans 8:15 and 8:23

2.2.1 Model and Vehicle

The question of which model underlies the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8:15 and 8:23 continues to be a topic of some debate, though it is most often discussed in terms of the "background" of the metaphor.[60] Recall that a model is a "consistent imaginative construct," or a "system of associated commonplaces," that lies beneath the surface of every metaphor.[61] In my earlier discussion on metaphor and model I identified three primary options put forth for the background of these metaphors: Greek adoption, Roman adoption, and Jewish sonship. However, unlike studies that attempt to isolate the background, I argued that it is likely that members of Paul's audience associated various elements from each of these backgrounds depending primarily on their ethnicity, religious background, and social location.

---

[58] See sections 3.2 and 3.3 of chapter 2 for a more detailed explanation.
[59] Jewett notes, "Paul's verb ordinarily has a military connotation, referring to the redemption of captives or prisoners of war either by victory or paying a ransom" (*Romans*, 519).
[60] See section 2.3.2 of chapter 2 and section 1 of chapter 4 for discussions of model.
[61] See section 2.3.2 of chapter 2; see also Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 41; Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 38.

Thus I will analyze the metaphors in Romans 8 with a framework that allows for elements of Greco-Roman adoption and Jewish sonship within the model.

I argued in chapter 2 that metaphors create their meaning by means of a *vehicle*. In Soskice's definition, a metaphor's vehicle is the "terms which are seen to be suggestive of another."[62] Moreover, a vehicle, which is a term in the text of the metaphor, has the potential to evoke one or more submerged models. The false dichotomy of mutually exclusive backgrounds in Romans 8 results from collapsing the vehicle (υἱοθεσία) and models of the metaphors into a single "background" rather than recognizing that metaphorical vehicles may draw simultaneously on more than one model. The primary vehicle of both 8:15 and 8:23 is unquestionably υἱοθεσία, with 8:15 also adding the vehicle αββα ὁ πατήρ. If we think of the metaphor's vehicle as the conduit, conductor, or transporter of the model(s), the limitations of "background" in Romans 8 disappear. Rather, the vehicle, υἱοθεσία, leads Paul's audience members to associate the model or models evoked by the vehicle. Moreover, if the model or models evoked occur in the minds of Paul's audience, then attempting to restrict the possible model to a single background implies that *precisely the same model is conjured by each member of the audience*.[63] Given factors such as the diversity in socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and gender likely present in Paul's audience, it is difficult to rule out one model entirely.[64] However, each model must underlie the vehicle, which *is bound to the text by the term υἱοθεσία.*

Proceeding with the understanding that no one model can be entirely ruled out, other factors in the context of Romans 8 are more suggestive of Roman adoption than Jewish sonship, but also the precise relationship between these two models in Romans 8 calls for more careful consideration. First, as I have already noted, Scott's exhaustive research demonstrates that υἱοθεσία, the vehicle of both 8:15 and 8:23, is a term that always denotes "adoption," and is never used as a general expression of

---

[62] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15.

[63] For another helpful critique on the difficulty of separating out particular "backgrounds" of υἱοθεσία see Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," 42-76.

[64] By positing that Paul's audience is comprised of an at least somewhat diverse group of people, I am not here intending to make a definitive statement regarding the precise makeup of the congregations in Rome. However, Jewett's argument that Paul's letter addresses at least "eight to ten separate congregations" in Rome, and that these congregations were comprised both of tenement churches and patron churches is persuasive (see *Romans*, 59-70; see also Peter Lampe, *Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries: From Paul to Valentinus*, trans. Michael Steinhauser, ed. Marshall D. Johnson [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003] 153-83).

sonship.[65] This in itself does not necessarily rule out the possibility of a Jewish sonship model, but it does mean that any model based on the Jewish sonship tradition is still filtered through the Greek word υἱοθεσία, which means "adoption."[66] Further illustrating this point, Sylvia Keesmaat argues, "[T]exts occur not only in relation to other texts but also in dialogue with other aspects of the cultures in which they occur."[67] Keesmaat's observation implies that texts (and in our case models) are continuously reappropriated and contextualized for new cultural settings, which further suggests that it is impossible to separate the models neatly into "Jewish sonship" and "Roman adoption."

However, it is also true that the likelihood of an audience member associating a model of Jewish sonship, which rests on the knowledge of Israelite history and Scripture, depends entirely on his or her familiarity with the history of the designation *sons of God* for ethnic Israel.[68] This familiarity among the gentiles in Paul's audience likely existed along a continuum, with some being quite familiar with Israel's Scriptures, and others less so. Dunn observes that while Christianity undoubtedly grew out of the Jewish community in Rome and "enjoyed a substantial link with the synagogue,"[69] following the edict of Claudius the Christian house churches "would have drawn in other Gentiles who had not previously been attracted to or been familiar with Judaism."[70] This leads me to conclude that in Romans 8, the Israelite sonship model is accessible to an audience member insofar as he or she was familiar with Israel's Scripture and traditions. Furthermore, for those audience members who were familiar with Israelite sonship, it is difficult to argue that the models would remain neatly separated in the cognitive space of their minds. It is far more likely that the models were blended with perhaps one model dominating the framework while the others provided subtle shading in the background.

---

[65] Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 45-55.
[66] Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," 42.
[67] Sylvia Keesmaat, "Exodus and the Intertextual Transformation of Tradition in Romans 8:14-30," *JSNT* 54 (1994): 33. Keesmaat herself reads Romans 8 through the lens of Jewish Scripture, and thus while her sentiment here is undoubtedly correct, her exegesis itself often does not grapple with the interplay between the recontextualization of Jewish texts and the Hellenistic elements which are also present.
[68] This issue will be taken up in greater detail in the following chapter on Romans 9:4 where the model of Jewish sonship is drawn fully into view by the text.
[69] Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, l.
[70] Ibid., liii.

Furthermore, because Paul uses a series of other terms that are connected to Roman adoption practices (υἱοθεσία, πατήρ, κληρονόμοι), I would argue that the dominant model in Romans 8:15 is drawn from Roman adoption. For example, Romans 8:15-17 connects the act of adoption (υἱοθεσία), with the enduring status of being both children and heirs of God (τέκνα θεοῦ; κληρονόμοι θεοῦ). Since the primary purpose of adoption in Roman culture was to secure an heir,[71] it seems likely that the presence of υἱοθεσία combined with kinship terms (v. 14 υἱοὶ θεοῦ; v. 15 αββα ὁ πατήρ, v.16 τέκνα) *and also with terms of inheritance* (κληρονόμοι and συγκληρονόμοι) would have conjured the model of Roman adoption for most, if not all, of Paul's audience members. Moreover, given the prominence of adoption in the Roman imperial family, it is difficult to imagine that Paul's audience would not have associated υἱοθεσία with the images of Roman adoption which loomed so largely in the culture surrounding the Roman church.[72]

The model associated with Romans 8:23 is perhaps less straightforward, as Paul seems to abruptly insert the υἱοθεσία metaphor into a context dominated by apocalyptic imagery of birth pangs, travail, and groaning. Furthermore, the relationship between the created order and the believers in verses 22-23 is debated among scholars. Burke comments, "Paul leaves his discussion of natural birth deliberately suspended in mid air as his thoughts shift from the imagery of biological birth of the inanimate order to a different and more important legal metaphor of adopted sons and daughters."[73] In contrast Gaventa remarks, "the eagerness with which all of creation longs for the apocalypse of God's children does not preclude God's children themselves from being part of that same eager expectation. Indeed, far from saying that the children are *not* part of creation's longing, v. 23 highlights their longing."[74] While Burke is right to identify two different metaphors in verse 22 (συνωδίνω) and 23 (υἱοθεσία), the overlap between other descriptions of both creation and believers (ἀπεκδέχομαι in vv. 19, 23; συστενάζω/στενάζω in vv. 22, 23) demonstrates the believers' solidarity with creation that Gaventa identifies.

---

[71] Peppard, *The Son of God*, 60.
[72] Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," 42; Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 31-33.
[73] Burke, "Adopted as Sons," 283.
[74] Beverly Roberts Gaventa, "Neither Height nor Depth: Discerning the Cosmology of Romans," *SJT* 64.3 (2011): 276-77.

How much of the Roman legal model and the Jewish sonship model underlie the vehicle υἱοθεσία in the context of verse 23? Paul's readers who were familiar with the texts in the Jewish sonship model would likely have continued to associate that model of sonship through verse 23. Since Paul has already used terms suggestive of Roman adoption in 8:15, it is likely that at least some parts of the Roman adoption are carried over in verse 23. However, the language of metaphorical birth pangs in verse 22 presents a somewhat competing image for υἱοθεσία in verse 23. The combination of a competing metaphor and the lack of terms directly related to Roman adoption (e.g. αββα ὁ πατήρ, κληρονόμος) dull the edges of the Roman model that is clearer in verse 15. To use Black's terminology, perhaps in verse 23 the Roman adoption model is more "submerged" than in 8:15, but it is also unlikely that the two metaphors evoke entirely different models since they occur in such close proximity to one another.

2.2.2. Tenor

Both the history of interpretation and contextual considerations make identifying the tenor of each υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 8 a slightly more complicated exegetical query than the identification of its vehicle and model(s). Since the tenors of the metaphors are not identical, I will address them here in turn. Recall that the tenor is the subject of the metaphor, or in Dawes's definition, the "subject upon which it is hoped light will be shed."[75] Remember also that the tenor of a metaphor need not be a term explicitly named in the subject, [76] which is likely the case in Romans 8:15. Taking into consideration the history of interpretation of adoption in 8:15 and also contextual constraints, I propose that three candidates for the metaphor's tenor emerge: (1) the salvation of the believer, (2) the reception of the Spirit, and (3) the initiation of God's relationship with the believer and his or her entrance into the community. This is not to say that these three tenors can be neatly separated, but rather my intention in the analysis below is to elucidate which of these tenors is dominant in Romans 8:15, with the possibility of the other options being present as subsidiary entailments of the metaphor.

The overwhelming majority of theological interpretations of Romans 8:15 either overtly state or tacitly assume that υἱοθεσία here is a metaphor "for

---

[75] Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 27.
[76] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 46-47.

salvation."[77] Substituting the terms of 8:15 in Soskice's definition, this renders the metaphor "whereby we speak about salvation in terms which are seen to be suggestive of adoption." Because of the prevalence of discourse on Paul's metaphors "for salvation," this construction of the metaphor likely seems perfectly reasonable and adequate.[78] However, equating adoption with the salvation of the believer (or believers) in Romans 8:15 in fact does not provide a comprehensive enough tenor for the metaphor. As stated previously, one difficulty in using "salvation" as the tenor of the metaphor is that it itself is a metaphor.[79] This is identifiable when we look at passages where σωτηρία occur in a conventional (i.e. non-metaphorical) context (e.g. Acts 7:25; Heb 11:7), and also where they occur as the vehicle of a metaphor (1 Chr 16:35; 2 Cor 6:2). In each of these contexts salvation implies rescue or deliverance, which is a different (though complementary) framework for thinking about God's action toward people.[80] Thus, each metaphor, "adoption" and "salvation," brings its own structure and set of entailments to the text, and therefore using one to explain the other complicates rather than elucidates the metaphor's true subject.

Another difficulty in using "salvation" as the tenor for the υἱοθεσία metaphor in 8:15 is that in this context it too narrowly focuses the meaning of "adoption" on the soteric benefits for the believers.[81] This narrow construction leaves little room for reflection on other aspects of the text, such as the presence of *both vertical and*

---

[77] E.g. Burke states, "*huiothesia* is another soteriological metaphorical expression for the apostle Paul" (*Adopted into God's Family*, 38); See also James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 469; Millard Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 974-78; Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 738; John Murray, *Collected Writings of John Murray*, vol. 2 (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1977), 234; Herman Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*, trans. John Richard de Witt (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 197-204; Thomas Schreiner, *Paul: Apostle of God's Glory in Christ* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2001), 240; Georg Strecker, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. M. Eugene Boring (New York: De Gruyter, 2000), 176.

[78] E.g. Dale B. Martin, *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990); Andreas B. du Toit, "Forensic metaphors in Romans and Their Soteriological Significance," in *Salvation in the New Testament*, ed. Jan G. van der Watt (NovTSup 121, Leiden: Brill, 2005), 213-46; D. François Tolmie, "Salvation as Redemption: The Use of 'Redemption' Metaphors in Pauline Literature," in *Idem*., 247-269.

[79] See sections 2.3.3 of chapter 2 and 2.3 of chapter 5.

[80] Here too it is helpful to remember that metaphors exist on a continuum from very "live" to "dead" or nearly dead. Due to its abundance in the biblical text, "salvation" is much further along the continuum than υἱοθεσία and could nearly be classified as a conventional metaphor. See also Beardsley, "The Metaphorical Twist," 301-302. However, its metaphorical roots are still apparent and thus it is problematic to use it to "explain" another metaphor because its own set of entailments will inevitably obscure some of the entailments of the other metaphor.

[81] E.g. Garner states, "'adoption'…is that overarching and foundational familial concept *under which* Paul articulates the specific *loci* of soteric blessing" ("Adoption in Christ," 245); see also Trumper, "The Theological History of Adoption II," 198.

horizontal kinship language (e.g. υἱοθεσία, υἱ**οί**, αββα ὁ πατήρ, κληρονόμ**οι**, ἀδελφ**οί**, **συ**γληρονόμ**οι**).[82] In exegesis that treats adoption as a metaphor for salvation, the vertical relationships (i.e. the relationship with the Father, Christ, and the Spirit) are usually noted.[83] However, the presence of plural endings throughout, and Paul's use of ἀδελφοί at the start of the passage (8:12) suggests that the tenor of the υἱοθεσία metaphor is also the believers' horizontal relationships to one another as brothers and sisters. Given that the scope of the metaphor seems to reach beyond the locus of the salvation of the individual believer, using "salvation" as a tenor for the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 8:15 is inadequate.

The second possibility of a tenor for the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 8:15 is the reception of the Spirit. If this were the case, the metaphor would be expressed as "speaking about the reception of the Spirit in terms which are seen to be suggestive of adoption." This option is attractive because of the prevalence of language about the Spirit in verses 1-16. Even more compelling is that Paul uses λαμβάνω twice in verse 15, which as Dunn remarks "certainly refers to the reception of the Spirit."[84] Similarly, Fitzmyer asserts, "The Spirit received constitutes adoptive sonship."[85] However, although it is undoubtedly the case that adoption and the Spirit are intimately connected, there are some difficulties with identifying the tenor of the υἱοθεσία metaphor with the reception of the Spirit. An examination of the possible translations for verse 15 will reveal that although υἱοθεσία is described as an event that happens concurrently with the reception of the Spirit, the tenor of the metaphor reaches beyond the event to implicate all three members of the Trinity.

The difficulties with identifying the tenor of υἱοθεσία with the reception of the Spirit can be seen in the various opinions regarding the classification of the genitive construction πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας. Barrett argues that πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας here means "the Spirit which anticipates adoption,"[86] while Cranfield, argues that it means "the Spirit

---

[82] Trebilco uses the categories "vertical" and "horizontal" to describe various self-designations for Christian communities in the New Testament (e.g. οἱ πιστοί and οἱ ἀδελφοί) ("What Shall We Call Each Other? Part One: The Issue of Self-Designations in the Pastoral Epistles," *TynBul* 53.2 [2002]: 239-58). I am suggesting that Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor combines both vertical and horizontal aspects into a single tenor.

[83] See, e.g. Burke, who labels υἱοθεσία an "organizing soteriological metaphor" (*Adopted into God's Family*, 41-45).

[84] Dunn, *Romans*, vol 1., 451.

[85] Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 500.

[86] Barrett, *Romans*, 163.

which brings about our adoption."[87] Further possibilities include "the Spirit who confirms our adoption,"[88] or "the Spirit who produces our adoption."[89] Although there is no general consensus as to which of these translations most accurately captures Paul's intention in verse 15, all of them seem to implicitly assume that there is more involved in a believer's υἱοθεσία than the reception of the Spirit. To be sure, the Spirit might be the agent, witness, or anticipator, but a believer's υἱοθεσία also involves the Father and the Son. These translations reflect that υἱοθεσία as a vehicle lends itself more naturally to a more complex and multifaceted tenor—one that involves at least all three members of the Trinity. Therefore, although the reception of the Spirit accompanies the adoption of the believer, the tenor of the metaphor must aim to encompass the actions of the Father, and Son as well.

A third option for the metaphor's tenor in 8:15 is the initiation of God's relationship with the believer and his or her entrance into the community of believers. Thus this version of the metaphor would read "speaking about the initiation of God's relationship with the believer and his or her entrance into the community of believers in terms which are seen to be suggestive of adoption." Unlike "salvation," this construction of the tenor seeks to explicitly encompass both the horizontal and vertical relationships described in the immediate context of the metaphor. Moreover, it has the potential to encompass the actions of all three members of the Trinity. The vehicle of the metaphor most naturally lends itself to the Father as the initiator of adoption, the Spirit as the witness, and the Son as the brother and coheir of the adoptees,[90] though each of these claims will need to be addressed in more detail below. This expression of the tenor also seeks to give credence to υἱοθεσία being a distinct, but related, concept to the ongoing *status* of sonship.[91] Thus, υἱοθεσία as a vehicle seems to lend itself naturally to a tenor that centers on the *process of becoming a son*. Thus it is distinct from concepts like υἱοί, τέκνα, or κληρονόμοι

[87] Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 1, 397; See also Dunn, "the spirit which effects adoption, or the spirit which expresses adoption" (*Romans*, vol. 1, 452).
[88] Moo, *Romans*, 502. Moo concedes that this translation may be overly subtle, stating "it may be better to think of the Spirit as the agent through whom the believer's sonship is both bestowed and confirmed" (ibid.).
[89] Jewett, *Romans*, 498.
[90] Burke's analysis also recognizes the role each member of the Trinity plays in the adoption of a believer (see *Adopted into God's Family*, 72-151).
[91] There is some debate over whether υἱοθεσία in Romans 8:15 refers more to the initial act of adoption or the ongoing status of sonship (which is even seen in the translation choices of "adoption" and "sonship"). See Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 1-9, 85-126; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 500; Moo, *Romans*, 501-502; Schreiner, *Romans*, 425.

which are vehicles that lend themselves to the expression of the ongoing status believers enjoy as a result of the act of υἱοθεσία. Expressing the tenor as the Trinity's initiation of relationship with the believer and the believer's entrance into the community of believers is a more comprehensive expression of the metaphor's subject, and thus it is preferable to the first two options.

Identifying the tenor in Romans 8:23 likewise presents us with several significant exegetical and interpretive difficulties, many of which arise from the inherent tension between verses 15 and 23. Some commentators have chosen to resolve the seeming contradiction between the two verses by appealing to manuscript evidence where υἱοθεσία is omitted from verse 23 entirely, but I have already shown that this is very unlikely.[92] The most often cited candidate for the metaphor's tenor is the "redemption of the body" due to the epexegetical construction: υἱοθεσίαν…τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν. For example, Moo states, "This final element in our adoption is 'the redemption of our bodies.'"[93] However, we have already seen the difficulty in substituting one metaphor (ἀπολύτρωσιν) for another (υἱοθεσία), and thus it is equally problematic to construe the metaphor in verse 23 as "whereby we speak about the redemption of our bodies in terms which are seen to be suggestive of adoption." This difficulty is only slightly improved if we substitute "resurrection," for "redemption." For example, Cranfield remarks, "The full manifestation of our adoption *is identical with* the final resurrection of our bodies at the Parousia."[94] However, although using "the resurrection of the body" would connect υἱοθεσία with the concrete future action of resurrection, reducing υἱοθεσία to the resurrection of the body does not reflect the whole tenor of the υἱοθεσία metaphor.[95] The difficulty with using the resurrection of the body as the tenor of υἱοθεσία in verse 23 is that the vehicle υἱοθεσία is inherently relational. As important as the resurrection of the body

---

[92] See, e.g. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 504, 510-11; Jewett, *Romans*, 505.

[93] Moo, *Romans*, 521. Moo is somewhat unique in his appreciation of the subtle difference between "redemption" and "resurrection," and his analysis indicates that he does not see these terms as entirely interchangeable. He states, "'Redemption' shares with 'adoption'…the 'already-not yet' tension that pervades [Paul's] theology, for the redemption can be pictured both as past and as future" (*Romans*, 521).

[94] Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 1, 419; See also Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*, 189-90; Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 109.

[95] Neither can "the redemption of the body" be reduced only to the resurrection. Redemption, too, is more fully orbed than "resurrection," which refers solely to the physical raising and eschatological restoration of the body. Redemption implies far more, including the former state of slavery and death that the body labored under, the fallen state of creation, and the freedom that accompany God's new creation; see also Moo, *Romans*, 520-21.

is to Pauline theology, resurrection is not relational in and of itself, but rather resurrection points to God as the initiator of resurrection on account of his relationship with the believers. Rather like the reception of the Spirit in Romans 8:15, resurrection should be seen as something that accompanies υἱοθεσία, or perhaps is the final evidence of the adoption of the believer, in verse 23.

To be sure, any proposal for the tenor of Romans 8:23 does need to take the relationship between verses 15 and 23 into account, as well as the future-directed perspective of verses 18-25. In light of these considerations, I propose that the tenor of the metaphor in verse 23 is God's eschatological action toward believers coupled with the believers' anticipation of those actions. Using Soskice's formula,[96] this renders the metaphor, "Speaking about God's eschatological action toward believers, and the believers' anticipation of those actions, in terms which are seen to be suggestive of adoption." Although this construction might seem cumbersome, it is necessary to state the tenor of the metaphor in terms that are seemingly vague because the totality of God's eschatological actions toward both creation and believers are not fully known. This is evidenced by the groaning of both creation and the believers as they eagerly wait and hope for things unseen (vv. 24-25). In addition, the tenor of the metaphor lies in the experience of anticipation itself because the locus of meaning seems to be in this shared experience of anticipating God's final act of adoption. Nils Dahl articulates this dialectic well: "What we find in the New Testament is due to the coincidence of eschatological doctrine and actual experience, where eschatology is 'realized', and 'reality' as given in Christ, is eschatologically interpreted."[97] Here in verse 23, the realized and the reality must be held together in the metaphor's tenor; the experience of present groaning and God's eschatological action are both firmly in view.[98]

[96] See section 2.3 of chapter 2 for a discussion on Soskice's definition of metaphor.
[97] Nils Dahl, "Christ, Creation, and the Church," in *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology*, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), 432.
[98] In addition, there is a strong connection between terms of anticipation in the text surrounding the metaphor and the metaphor's ability to structure and influence the collective experience of the audience members, which will be explored in greater detail below.

2.3 The Frame: Romans 8:12-25

Black's concept of the "frame" of the metaphor, which is the surrounding context that contributes to the overall meaning of the metaphor,[99] poses an interesting question for the analysis of the two υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8:15 and 23. In his explanation of "frame," Black limits the term to the sentence in which the metaphor occurs. Under Black's terminology, strictly speaking then, there is a different frame for each υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 8. However, a slight emendation to Black's understanding of "frame" will illuminate the cohesiveness of Paul's two uses of υἱοθεσία in this context. In keeping with Black's terminology from pictures and artwork, I propose to view the two metaphors in Romans 8 as part of a diptych. By "diptych" I mean that in Romans 8 the two metaphors comprise something of a continuous image divided into two parts and contained in the same overarching frame. Furthermore, although it is almost customary to treat verses 18-25 as a separate section from verses 12-17, these two distinct "frames" are joined by several themes which they share in common. Indeed, running through the entirety of verses 12-25 is the role and activity of the Spirit (vv. 13, 14, 15, 16, 23), the images of bondage and redemption (vv. 12, 15, 21, 23), and most importantly for our purposes here, the motif of adoption and sonship (vv. 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23).[100]

Since there is such a high degree of continuity in the themes in 8:12-25, I will treat these two metaphors as two complementary parts of the same frame. If the meaning of the metaphor is to some degree dependent on its surrounding frame, it is necessary to examine here several of the other important features of verses 12-25 that provide the surrounding structure for the metaphor. The first of these elements is the σάρξ/πνεῦμα dichotomy, which was discussed above. This dichotomy is introduced first in verses 4-9 and continues in verse 12, providing the antithesis for the υἱοθεσία metaphor in verse 15. In Romans 8 the meaning of σάρξ is unambiguously negative, and, as Dunn argues, denotes "the weakness and corruptibility of the creature which distances him from the Creator."[101] Within the context of Romans 8 it is perhaps best to understand σάρξ as Paul's description of fallenness and corruption both of the created order to which the believer is bound in his corrupted flesh and of the

---

[99] Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 27-28. See section 2.2.1 of chapter 2 for a more detailed explanation.
[100] See also Susan Eastman, "Whose Apocalypse: The Identity of the Sons of God in Romans 8:19," *JBL* 121.2 (2002): 266.
[101] Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 363.

fallenness of the believer's moral behavior, which is described in terms of slavery to sin.

The Spirit/Flesh dichotomy is important for the υἱοθεσία metaphor because of the implied connection between σάρξ and slavery and πνεῦμα and adoption. Moo remarks, "[T]he contrast between being 'in the flesh' and 'in the Spirit' is a contrast between belonging to the old age of sin and death and belonging to the new age of righteousness and life."[102] If the σάρξ/πνεῦμα dichotomy is primarily a description of two ages and two modes of existence, then the frame in 8:12-25 presents the υἱοθεσία metaphor *as an image of transfer* between existence κατὰ σάρκα and existence κατὰ πνεῦμα. Regarding the σάρξ/πνεῦμα dichotomy, Schlier poignantly writes, "Das menschliche Leben ist immer ein geschuldetes,"[103] and thus υἱοθεσία marks the change in the believers' position, obligation, and allegiance. Moreover, Paul further illuminates the tension between σάρξ and πνεῦμα when he describes the believers' existence κατά πνεῦμα in verses 18-25, where the Spirit causes the believers to groan in recognition "that the life of the Spirit cannot yet achieve full expression in the believer's present [fleshly and unredeemed] embodiment."[104]

A second important feature that provides the structure of the frame surrounding the metaphor is Paul's emphasis on suffering, hope, and glory. Morna Hooker observes, "For Paul, being in Christ means sharing in the dying as well as the living, in the giving as well as the receiving, in the poverty as well as the riches, in the humiliation as well as the glory."[105] Likewise in Romans 8, Paul is quite clear that receiving the Spirit of adoption is inextricably linked to becoming a co-sufferer with Christ (vv. 15-17). As the frame of the metaphor unfolds, the suffering Paul speaks of is also intimately connected to life in the Spirit, and it seems to arise from the believers' acute realization that they are caught up in the eschatological tension between the now and not yet. Bauckham links both suffering and hope to the groaning of believers in verse 23 stating, "[T]heir groaning is not only an expression of suffering, but also a yearning in hope for the redemption yet to come."[106] The themes of suffering, hope, and glory are also expanded to a cosmic scale in verses 18-25,

---

[102] Moo, *Romans*, 489.
[103] Schlier, *Römerbrief*, 250.
[104] Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 490; see also Richard Bauckham, "The Story of the Earth according to Paul: Rom 8:18-23," *RevExp* 108 (2011): 96.
[105] Morna Hooker, "Interchange in Christ and Ethics," *JSNT* 25 (1985): 14.
[106] Bauckham, "The Story of the Earth," 96.

where creation waits with longing, and the sons of God groan in solidarity with creation awaiting God's eschatological action of final restoration. Beker captures this well when he asserts, "It is clear that hope for Paul, in order to be authentic, must have a solid base or ground; moreover, it must have a cosmic horizon and it must as well have concrete objectives and specific goals."[107] In Romans 8:12-25 Paul combines the cosmic horizon of hope with the intimate and familial action of adoption, which gives voice and purpose to the believers' groaning as they await God's final eschatological action.

A final, albeit somewhat implicit component of the frame in verses 12-25 is the activity of the Trinity that undergirds the entirety of the passage.[108] The Spirit leads, bears witness, and groans together with the spirit of believers (vv. 26-27), marking the believers' transition from enslavement to the flesh to sonship of God. The Father is implicitly the agent who initiates the adoption of the believers, evidence by the '*abbā* cry in verse 15. By extension, the Father is the initiator of the revelation of the children of God at the end of the age, and also the one who subjected creation to futility. The Son is named as the brother and heir of the adopted sons, and the σύν prefixes suggest not only solidarity in kinship, but perhaps even participation in the person of Christ. In addition, Paul makes an implicit connection between the resurrection of the Son and the hope of redemption of believers' bodies.[109]

2.4 Emphasis and Resonance in Romans 8:15 and 23

Of the four occurrences of υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans and Galatians, the two occurrences in Romans 8 are arguably the two most emphatic. Recall that a metaphor is emphatic to the degree that it will not brook the substitution of another word or words.[110] In Romans 8 the υἱοθεσία metaphor draws attention to the mode of entrance into sonship specifically, and the ongoing status comes into full view as Paul's train of thought develops further and as more kinship terms appear. If we consider the metaphor as a description of the method of entrance, then it is clear that υἱοθεσία provides quite a specific and unique description of this entrance.[111] Indeed,

---

[107] J. Christiaan Beker, "Suffering and Triumph in Paul's Letter to the Romans," *HBT* 7.2 (1985): 106.
[108] See also Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*, 72-151; idem, "Adopted as Sons," 267-78.
[109] See also Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 255-66.
[110] Black, "More about Metaphor," 26.
[111] See Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 3-61 for the lexical evidence for words in the semantic domain of "adoption."

the image of υἱοθεσία as a depiction of a believer's passage to sonship is clearly not replaceable by other descriptions of entrance to sonship (e.g. birth) or by general kinship terms which imply the status achieved by υἱοθεσία (e.g. υἱός and τέκνα). The case for emphasis is particularly strong in Romans 8:23, where the υἱοθεσία metaphor occurs in rather jarring contrast to the imagery of birth and travail that dominates the landscape in the preceding verses. As Burke remarks, "[T]he suspension of the biological imagery of natural birth (vv. 19-22) used to describe the non-human order and the subsequent shift to the new imagery of adoption (vv. 23-25) needs to be properly recognized."[112] Paul is clear in both occurrences of the metaphor that the believers' sonship is achieved by their *adoption to sonship*, and not by any other means, making each instance emphatic according to Black's definition.

The two occurrences of υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 are also arguably the most resonant of the instances of Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors. Recall that Black defines resonant metaphors as "utterances that support a high degree of implicative elaboration."[113] In the case of verse 15 Paul names some of the implications explicitly, such as the cry of αββα ὁ πατήρ and the connection between adoption and inheritance that continues in verse 16. The connection between the υἱοθεσία metaphor and the ensuing related terms led Käsemann to remark of verses 16-17, "the consequences of sonship are mentioned in order to show its irreversibility."[114] I would further suggest that Paul's explication of these particular implications might indicate that other implications (e.g. the believers as brothers and sisters) are also latent in the metaphor in verse 15.

In contrast, the metaphor in verse 23 is possibly less resonant since it is set in an epexegetical construction with ἀπολύτρωσιν. This construction has caused some to conclude that υἱοθεσία is subsumed under the metaphor of redemption, which would make redemption the more resonant metaphor of the pair.[115] However, the resonance of the metaphor in verse 15 reverberates through the subsequent verses, making further elaboration in verse 23 unnecessary. Moreover, both redemption and adoption in verse 23 are resonant metaphors, and that the implications of each metaphor build

[112] Burke, "Adopted as Sons," 283.
[113] Black, "More About Metaphor," 26.
[114] Käsemann, *Romans*, 229.
[115] E.g. Burke, "Adopted as Sons," 279-86; Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 491; Käsemann, *Romans*, 237; Osborne, *Romans*, 209; Schreiner, *Romans*, 439.

upon the implications of the other. The interplay between the two metaphors in verse 23, redemption and adoption, highlights the tension between the two modes of existence outlined in the frame. Thus, rather than diminishing the level of resonance in verse 23 the juxtaposition of adoption and redemption in verse 23 likely functions to increase the resonance of both metaphors (redemption and adoption), rendering each occurrence of υἱοθεσία in Romans 8 both emphatic and resonant.

3. Metaphor and Audience

In the previous section I examined various elements of the two υἱοθεσία metaphors that were bound to the text and delineated their subjects and relationship to the surrounding context more precisely. In this section the task is to move beyond the confines of the text to explore the possible ways the two υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 shaped the perceptions, emotions, and identity of Paul's audience. I have shown in chapter three that metaphors are powerful and active agents, rather than neutral conduits of information, capable of altering and influencing the perceptions of the hearer/reader.[116] Thus I will here examine the cognitive structure that is created by Paul's two υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8, and how this structure might have influenced the perception of his audience by highlighting and hiding certain aspects of their Christian experience. Coupled with questions pertaining to cognitive structure, this section will also proffer a suggestion for the emotional response evoked by these two metaphors. The last question this section will address is how the cognitive structure and emotional content of the metaphor might work together to form bonds between members of Paul's community. Since I argued above that the two metaphors in Romans 8 should be treated as two parts of a diptych, here too I will treat them as complementary expressions within a single unit of thought. This is not necessarily to say that each metaphor produces precisely the same cognitive structure, but rather to recognize that they occur in such close proximity that it would be artificial to treat them as two discrete units producing neatly separable sets of cognitive structures and emotions.

[116] See section 2.1 of chapter 3 for a fuller discussion.

3.1 Metaphor and Perception

I argued in chapter three that metaphors influence the perception of their hearers by providing a particular cognitive structure which is created in the mind of the hearer by the metaphor's vehicle.[117] This cognitive structure highlights and hides features of the metaphor's tenor, thereby influencing and altering the perception of the audience member.[118] Thus the first task here is to elucidate the cognitive structure created by the two υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 and the second task is to consider what features of the tenor are highlighted and hidden by this structure. A key preliminary observation to this discussion is to note that the cognitive structure evoked by the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 has both vertical and horizontal dimensions. To be more specific, the cognitive structure touches on both how the audience member perceives himself or herself in relation to God and in relation to other members of the community.[119] Moreover, the interplay between the two metaphors creates a cognitive structure with temporal dimensions as well. While the vertical dimension of the cognitive structure has been extensively investigated, the horizontal and temporal structures of the metaphor have been somewhat neglected.[120] I will examine each of these dimensions in turn, focusing more attention on the two areas that have perhaps been somewhat overlooked by other studies.

3.1.1. Cognitive Framework and Romans 8:15 and 23

The vertical dimensions of the cognitive structure created by the metaphor involve both adoption as a "method of entrance" or "method of kinship formation" and the ensuing status of sonship and privilege of inheritance that adoption achieves. Paul's use of υἱοθεσία as a metaphor for kinship formation between God and humanity is both rare and emphatic,[121] though the image of adoption was widely available in the surrounding culture.[122] I have already discussed above that in Romans

---

[117] See section 2.1.1 of chapter 3; see also Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 44-47.
[118] Lakoff and Turner, *More Than Cool Reason*.
[119] See also Trebilco, "What Shall We Call Each Other?," 239-58.
[120] Garner's thesis addresses the metaphors' temporal dimensions, though his theological reading does not seek to answer questions regarding the metaphors' affective potential ("Adoption in Christ," 41-55); Byrne and Burke also address the eschatological cast of the υἱοθεσία metaphors to varying degrees in their respective studies (Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 103-126); (Burke, *Adopted Into God's Family*, 177-93).
[121] See section 2.2.2 of chapter 2 for a discussion on emphasis.
[122] For a survey of the lexical evidence see Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 13-60; see also Jewett, *Romans*, 498; Peppard, *The Son of God*, 50-85.

8, υἱοθεσία as a method of entrance into sonship is closely linked with the reception of the Spirit.[123] However, it is also necessary to differentiate between the metaphor of adoption and the experience of receiving the Spirit, which is the event Paul links to the metaphor. I discussed in chapter three that one of the functions of a metaphor can be to provide a cognitive structure for a particular experience or set of experiences, and this is precisely how the υἱοθεσία metaphors are functioning in Romans 8:15 and 8:23. That is to say that in verse 15 the υἱοθεσία metaphor provides the believer with a particular cognitive structure for the experience of receiving the Holy Spirit.

The cognitive structure υἱοθεσία creates for the experience of receiving the Spirit also entails the activity and agency of all three members of the Trinity. The metaphor evokes the familiar cultural image of adoption in which the Father (*paterfamilias*) is the initiator of the adoption. In this respect, as Peppard observes, "[T]he imagery is perfectly in line with our knowledge about adoption in Roman society."[124] Thus the vertical aspects of the cognitive structure that υἱοθεσία creates depicts the relationship forged between the believer and the Father as the prerogative of the Father. The vertical dimensions of the cognitive structure constructed by the metaphor in Romans 8:15 is one of call and response, of initiation and acknowledgment.

Through the metaphor the believer is led to understand that the Father has extended him or her sonship by divine initiative, and the believer is led to respond by acknowledging God as Father in the intimate cry of the heart through the Spirit. Moreover, the believers' cry roots them firmly in the cry of Jesus the Son. Sigve Tonstad remarks, "Not only has the believer become the adopted and obedient son of the Father, but he has also adopted Jesus' *view* of the Father."[125] Moreover, the cognitive framework created by υἱοθεσία also entails the status believers are granted by virtue of their υἱοθεσία. Following the Father's initiation of sonship in 8:15, verse 17 links the status of sonship with the further designations κληρονόμοι and συγκληρονόμοι…Χριστοῦ. These designations are clearly entailments of the cognitive structure created by υἱοθεσία in verse 15, as inheritance and adoption are closely

[123] This is not to say that the tenor of the metaphor is the reception of the Spirit, but rather Paul connects υἱοθεσία to the event of receiving the Spirit.
[124] Peppard, *The Son of God*, 135.
[125] Sigve Tonstad, "The Revisionary Potential of 'Abba! Father' in the Letters of Paul," *AUSS* 45.1 (2007): 11.

linked in the underlying cultural model of Roman adoption practices.[126] Moreover, by using a σύν prefix Paul again builds a cognitive structure where the believers' sonship and Christ's sonship are intimately connected.

However, in considering the vertical dimensions of the cognitive structure in relation to 8:23 some complications arise. As we have already seen, the tension between 8:15 and 8:23 is well documented, but it is perhaps less clear what impact the tension between "receiving the Spirit of adoption" and "eagerly awaiting adoption" has on the cognitive structure produced by the interaction between the two metaphors in Romans 8. Branick argues that the tension between verses 15 and 18 "suggests the beginnings of realized eschatology. The result is not a clear eschatological picture, worked out with systematic consistency, but rather an inconsistent picture, one of internal tensions."[127] However, far from muddying the cognitive structure, the tension between the two metaphors in Romans 8 in fact enriches the believer's perception of the activity of the Trinity. The Father is not only the Father who initiates the adoption of the believer, but he is also the one who will redeem creation from its bondage, and for whom the believer longingly awaits. The Spirit is not only the Spirit who testifies to adoption, but also the Spirit who groans and intercedes for the believer as he or she waits for the revelation of the sons of God (v. 21). The Son is not only the coheir, but also the believer's brother, co-sufferer, and the source of hope for the resurrection of the body (vv. 23-25). The tension between the two metaphors is mirrored in the actions of the Trinity, further emphasizing the perception of a familial bond within the believers.

In addition to the vertical dimensions of the υἱοθεσία metaphor which are already well-worn avenues of exegesis,[128] the cognitive structure created by the υἱοθεσία also has several strong horizontal components.[129] The horizontal axis of the metaphor is most clearly seen in Paul's choice to express the υἱοθεσία of believers using plural nouns and verbs (ἐλάβετε, κράζομεν, πνεύματι ἡμῶν, ἐσμὲν τέκνα

[126] See Peppard, *The Son of God*, 135-140; Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," 51-55.
[127] Branick, "Apocalyptic Paul," 670.
[128] See especially Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*; Byrne, *"Sons of God"*; Scott, *Adoption as Sons*.
[129] *Pace* Aasgaard who sees only vertical dimensions in Rom 8:15-29 (*"My Beloved Brothers and Sisters,"* 145-50).

θεοῦ).[130] The cognitive structure created by Paul's use of plural forms also creates the perception of horizontal kinship relationships between the members of his audience who are included in the scope of these plural designations. Of these horizontal relationships Burke remarks, "Paul's use of his adoption metaphor…[enables] the Jewish and Gentile house churches to see that they belong together as members in a single household."[131] Indeed, the metaphor does not merely allow Paul's audience to see, but as a performative utterance actually creates the perception of other community members as brothers and sisters of the same family. Having all entered into sonship by the same means (υἱοθεσία), believers are further united under the communal designations κληρονόμοι and συγκληρονόμοι…Χριστοῦ, and through the communal activities of συμπάσχομεν and συνδοξασθῶμεν. Paul's language here is striking in that it suggests that the believers' adoption unites them to Christ (seen in the σύν prefixes) and at the same time binds them to other members of the community as co-sharers in the adoption. J. R. Daniel Kirk states that this "is not an abstract 'pattern' of suffering leading to glory; rather, the movement from suffering to glory forms the plot of Christ's story in which the believer participates."[132] The link between the horizontal and the vertical dimensions of the cognitive structure is further confirmed later in Romans 8 where Christ is designated πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς (v. 29).

The temporal aspects of the cognitive structure the two metaphors create when taken together are perhaps the most difficult to grasp, or at least the most difficult to adequately capture. How is it possible that believers are described as both "sons/children" (υἱοί/τέκνα) who have received the Spirit of adoption (8:15-16) and yet are eagerly awaiting adoption (Rom 8:23)?[133] Or even perhaps more fundamentally, what cognitive framework is in play for Paul to even begin to speak of believers in this state of "caught between-ness?" As I have stated already, the exegetical tension between Paul's statements that believers "have received the Spirit of adoption" in verse 15 and that believers also "groan inwardly, eagerly awaiting the

---

[130] See also Gordon Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), 585; Marianne Meye Thompson, *The Promise of the Father: Jesus and God in the New Testament* (Louisville: WJK, 2000), 129.
[131] Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*, 171.
[132] J. R. Daniel Kirk, "Appointed Son(s): An Exegetical Note on Romans 1:4 and 8:29," *BBR* 14.2 (2004): 241.
[133] See also Schlier's fourfold description of believers as sons of God (*Römerbrief*, 252).

adoption, the redemption of our bodies" in verse 23 has usually been resolved by appealing to Paul's "already/not yet" eschatology. Of the eschatological tension, Schreiner states "[T]his fits Paul's already-but-not-yet eschatology in which the blessings of the future age are already ours and yet they become ours fully only at the day of redemption and resurrection."[134] However, Schreiner's explanation betrays the familiarity of the Pauline "already/not yet" eschatology, which masks the deep eschatological and existential tension present in the cognitive structure that Paul creates through his use of the two υἱοθεσία metaphors. In order to break free from the familiarity of the "already/not yet" understanding of Romans 8, it is more helpful to view the cognitive structure created by the two metaphors as one of temporal displacement. To clarify, the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 8:15 creates a cognitive structure that causes the readers and hearers to perceive time (this present age and the age to come), and their relationship to it, differently.

Having received the Spirit of adoption, the believers move not only from slavery to sonship, but also from possessing the mindset of the flesh to possessing the mindset of the Spirit (vv. 6-7). The Spirit is associated with the age to come (v. 23), and flesh and slavery are associated with the bondage of this present age (vv. 14-15; 18-21). Thus if Paul has utilized υἱοθεσία as a metaphor to convey the change between slavery and sonship evidenced by the reception of the eschatological Spirit, then by extension the cognitive structure created by the metaphors creates a change in the way the believers perceive time. Dunn contends, "The gift of the Spirit disturbs and disrupts what was previously a settled pattern."[135] This disruption is precisely what Paul captures in his juxtaposition of the two υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8. If believers have received the eschatological gift of the Spirit and also enjoy the eschatological status of "son/child," then, in some sense, the cognitive structure of the metaphor entails that they perceive themselves as existing within or according to the age to come. However, the future aspect of υἱοθεσία in verse 23 simultaneously proffers a cognitive framework which entails that believers also perceive their existence according to "this present time" (v. 18) while they groan and anxiously await their adoption. Moo summarizes the change in the believers' cognitive structure this way: "the very fact that the Spirit is only the 'first fruits' makes us sadly

[134] Schreiner, *Romans*, 439.
[135] Dunn, "Spirit Speech," 87.

conscious that we have 'not yet' severed all ties to the old age of sin and death."[136] Thus, the cognitive structure that these metaphors effect creates the perception for believers that they are somewhat uncomfortably caught between the two ages.[137]

The combination of vertical, horizontal, and temporal dimensions in the cognitive structure created by the two υἱοθεσία metaphors has significant ramifications for the ways the metaphors influence the perception of the audience members. The use of υἱοθεσία as a vertical description for the believer's relationship with God simultaneously provides a framework through which the believer perceives the Triune God as the initiator of an intimate, filial relationship, and also perceives himself or herself in that relationship as a son of God. The metaphors also forge a cognitive structure with horizontal dimensions that lead the believer to perceive the other members of his or her community as co-sons, co-heirs, co-sufferers, and co-groaners awaiting God's final act of adoption together. The horizontal dimensions of the cognitive framework also yield the perception that the believers are drawn together into community by their collective relationship to Christ, their brother and firstborn (v. 29). Moreover, when taken together the two υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 create a cognitive framework that produces the perception of temporal displacement within the audience members. Their adoption creates the perception that they have been transferred into the age of the Spirit, which means that they in some sense perceive their existence according to the age to come. However, the framework also necessitates that they simultaneously perceive that they are still awaiting the full expression of that transfer, and that they somehow also still exist and suffer within this present age. These two seemingly contradictory frameworks produce the perception of an acute eschatological tension that is not only recognized intellectually but also, as I will argue in more detail below, experienced at a profoundly existential level.

3.1.2 Highlighting and Hiding in Romans 8

These three dimensions (vertical, horizontal, and temporal) of the cognitive framework effected by the two metaphors actively highlight some aspects of the believers' relationship to God and to one another while hiding and obscuring

---

[136] Moo, *Romans*, 520.
[137] See also Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 489-91; J. Christiaan Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 279.

others.[138] This section will examine these potential areas by considering the cognitive framework created by the two metaphors in Romans 8 in relation to the internal and external evidence regarding the makeup of Paul's audience and what issues would have been of particular concern to them and to Paul. Having recognized that metaphors are powerful agents of persuasion that actively influence the perception of their hearers/readers,[139] the question here in the exegesis is what potential elements of God's activity, the believers' relationship to God and each other, and the believers' understanding of time and eschatology are highlighted through the cognitive framework constructed by the two metaphors in Romans 8.

As discussed earlier, the cognitive framework created by the two metaphors in Romans 8 provides a particular structure through which the believer perceives his or her vertical relationship to God, and through which she or he also perceives God's activity toward the believers. What elements in particular does this structure highlight and hide? Furthermore, it must be recognized at the outset that this framework is not the only, or even the primary framework through which the audience perceives their vertical relationship,[140] and thus the analysis must also seek to recognize the limitations of the cognitive structure, which are complemented by other metaphors elsewhere in Romans.

The first vertical element that υἱοθεσία highlights quite clearly is the divine initiative and activity of making sons of Paul's audience members in Rome. The cognitive structure of the metaphors frames the status of sonship as something that God achieves through adoption, not as a status that people achieve or attain to. Dunn remarks, "The metaphor is a reminder that the relation of sonship to God is not a 'natural' one but a status achieved for humankind by divine choice."[141] The theocentric emphasis of the metaphor, which highlights God's activity, is further seen

[138] See section 2.1.2 of chapter 3 for a more thorough treatment of this feature; see also Lakoff and Turner, *More than Cool Reason*, 60-70; Zhang, "Corporate Identity Metaphor," 381.
[139] See section 2.1 of chapter 3; see also Booth, "Metaphor as Rhetoric," 47-70; Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 139-46.
[140] Burke recognizes this as well, stating, "I am not saying that adoption is the most significant of other Pauline soteriological metaphors," but rather he recognizes that "Paul's understanding of what God in Jesus Christ has done for sinful humanity is so rich, diverse and kaleidoscopic that it ought not to be reduced to a single expression" (*Adopted into God's Family*, 37-38).
[141] Dunn, "Spirit Speech," 83.

in the believers' cry "Abba, Father," rather than "I am God's son."[142] Moreover, the believers are passively described as those who "receive the Spirit of adoption," again highlighting the Spirit's activity within the vertical relationship. Schlatter eloquently states that the work of the Spirit is "daß wir Gott Vater nennen, nicht mit der Zunge, während das Herz fern von ihm ist, sondern so, daß wir zu ihm rufen mit dem herzlichen Vertrauen, das zu seinem Auge aufwärts schaut als zu unseres Vaters Auge."[143] As the Spirit enables the believers to call upon the Father, the believers as sons also stand alongside Christ who is the preeminent son, co-participants in both his suffering and his glory (v. 17). In verse 23 the metaphor creates some space for the response of the believer to the divine activity, but the response to the reception of the Spirit is to eagerly wait and long for God's final restorative actions.

Coupled with its emphasis on divine activity, the cognitive framework of υἱοθεσία in Romans 8 also highlights the impartiality of God, which is a clear focus of the letter to the Romans as whole (1:16; 2:11-16; 3:9, 19-20, 30; 4:9; 5:12-21; 9:24; 10:12; 11:32; 14:1-12; 15:7-13). Although divine impartiality is closely connected with the justice of God's judgment in Romans,[144] it is also integrally connected with Paul's understanding of God's redemptive and salvific action towards both Jews and Gentiles. As Bassler aptly states, "God's impartiality in judgment is matched by his impartiality in grace."[145] Paul has argued strongly in previous chapters that God's ministry transcends outward ethnic and religious designations of Jew and Gentile (e.g. 2:28-29; 3:9-19, 29-30; 4:11-12),[146] and in the context of Romans 8, God acts without distinction to impart the Spirit of adoption to all who are in Christ Jesus (8:1). Likewise, the υἱοθεσία metaphor further undergirds the theme of God's impartiality that runs throughout the letter by providing an avenue of kinship formation apart from biological lineage and ethnicity. Jewett argues, "this link between Spirit and divine sonship…defines the varied groups of believers in Rome as

---

[142] Leon Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Pillar New Testament Commentary, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 316; for a more detailed discussion of the origin and use of the '*abbā* cry see section 1.3 of chapter 5.
[143] Adolf Schlatter, *Der Brief an die Römer* (Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament 5, Stuttgart: Calwer, 1987), 154.
[144] See e.g. Jouette M. Bassler, "Divine Impartiality in Paul's Letter to the Romans," *NovT* 26.1 (1984): 45-49.
[145] Ibid., 54.
[146] Richard Hays states this well: "The fundamental problem with which Paul is wrestling in Romans is *not* how a person may find acceptance with God; the problem is to work out an understanding of the relationship in Christ between Jews and Gentiles" (*The Conversion of the Imagination: Essays on Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005], 69).

God's family, adopted by him through the Spirit into a position of extraordinary honor."[147] However, this is not to say that the cognitive framework created by υἱοθεσία in Romans 8 does away with ethnic distinctions, but rather it provides a structure through which those of differing ethnic backgrounds can be made sons of the same family through the impartial divine initiative of God.[148]

There are several important features that the horizontal dimension of the cognitive framework highlights for the believers in terms of how they perceive their relationship to other community members. First, the cognitive framework forged by υἱοθεσία in Romans 8 highlights the equality between members of the community and emphasizes for the believers that sonship is not based on ethnicity or religious background, but rather is based on the adopting activity of God (Father, Son, and Spirit). Furthermore, all believers have received sonship through the divine initiative of God, and all are heirs and subordinate to the firstborn, Christ (8:29). Moreover, in Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphors there is no hint of the sibling rivalry found in Roman literature,[149] where inheritance was a chief culprit for sparking discord among siblings, especially in instances of adoption.[150] Rather, as Peppard observes,

> In Paul's cosmic vision, the privileged son of the father – the πρωτότοκος–is instead engaged in the process of making more children for the father, of increasing the size of the family. This son is paradoxically eager to share and thus dilute his inheritance.[151]

The cognitive structure of the metaphor also effectively hides those ethnic and religious boundaries that would inhibit some members from forming intimate bonds

---

[147] Jewett, *Romans*, 497.

[148] See also J. C. Beker, "The Faithfulness of God and the Priority of Israel in Paul's Letter to the Romans," *HTR* 79 (1986): 10-16. Beker claims, "Paul's emphasis on the equality of Jew and Greek in the body of Christ does not nullify the distinctiveness of both peoples….[I]t is wrong to suppose that the emphasis on *pas* or *anthrôpos* blots out the ethnic specificity of two different peoples, Jews and Gentiles," (Ibid., 13). Beker's analysis is correct in that Paul's argument in Romans does not do away with ethnic distinctions, but Beker's classification of Jews and Gentiles as "two different peoples" is problematic in that it does not recognize that the label "gentile" is a generic term for all outsiders to the Jewish community, and does not necessarily pick out a specific ethnic designation (see also Paul Trebilco, "Creativity at the Boundary: Features of the Linguistic and Conceptual Construction of Outsiders in the New Testament," *NTS* (forthcoming).

[149] Plutarch warns against rivalry and jealousy among siblings stating "It is therefore of no slight importance to resist the spirit of contentiousness and jealousy among brothers when it first creeps in over trivial matters, practicing the art of making mutual concessions, of learning to take defeat, and of taking pleasure in indulging brothers rather than winning victories over them" (*Frat. amor.* 488a).

[150] This is especially evident in imperial adoptions; see e.g. Tacitus, *Ann.* 12.25-69 on the relationship between Britannicus and Nero; Dio Cassius, *Roman History,* 69.20 on Hadrian's adoption; on sibling rivalry between biological siblings see Luke 15:11-32; Sir 33:20-24; Xenophon, *Mem.* 2.3.5-18; Aasgaard, *"My Beloved Brothers and Sisters,"* 77-81.

[151] Peppard, *The Son of God*, 140.

with members of different backgrounds from themselves by designating all members from all backgrounds with the same status of "adopted son." Hodge rightly remarks, "In Paul the spirit serves as a version of 'shared blood.'"[152] Thus the metaphor functions as an equalizer by creating the perception among believers that those ethnic and religious differences have become of secondary importance to the unity achieved by becoming adopted sons of the same family where they are all subordinate to Christ as the firstborn son (Rom 8:29).

The horizontal dimensions of the cognitive structure constructed by the two υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 also highlight the solidarity between members by connecting their adoption to their shared experience of suffering and longing for God's final restorative action. Thus the two metaphors create the perception of a commonly held experience of God's initiating act of adoption, and they also highlight the shared experience of the community of believers by structuring this experience through the cognitive framework of adoption. Beker argues convincingly that in Romans 8 "the call to suffering is here a call by the Spirit and involves *the communal solidarity and activity of the body of Christ*."[153] Or as Schlier states, "Unser Leiden ist nie ein einsames."[154] In addition, the experience of suffering and communal solidarity is drawn firmly into view through the framework of the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8. Conversely, the metaphors' ability to create the perception of solidarity by highlighting the shared experience of community members also might aid in diminishing some of the ongoing differences between members of the community in Rome by refocusing their attention to the common bond of kinship forged by adoption.

The temporal dimensions of the cognitive framework created by the two metaphors in Romans 8 serve to highlight the profound temporal displacement of those who have "received the Spirit of adoption" and yet are still eagerly awaiting God's final act of adoption in the age to come. Schlatter observes that those who have received the Spirit "seufzen nicht nur aus Mitgefühl mit den anderen, sondern unserer selbst wegen."[155] The disjunctive temporal framework created by the metaphors

---

[152] Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 76. Though in her analysis Hodge limits the scope of adoption to "the gentiles," the likelihood of a minority of Jews in Paul's audience coupled with the adoption metaphor predicated of Israel in Rom 9:4 makes such a limitation unwarranted.
[153] Beker, "Suffering and Triumph," 111 (emph. mine).
[154] Schlier, *Römerbrief*, 255.
[155] Schlatter, *Römer*, 161.

serves to emphasize the believers' separation from "the present age," creating the internal perception that they belong to a different mode of existence as those who have received the adoption, resulting in sighing and groaning for their final restoration. Moo argues that Romans 8 communicates "a necessary and appropriate sense of 'incompleteness' in our Christian experience and a consequent and eager longing for that incompleteness to be overcome."[156] This framework created by the two υἱοθεσία metaphors highlights the expectation of eschatological hope, as God's future restorative action is linked to the reception of the Spirit which testifies to the reality of the believers' adoption.

Alternately, the temporal dimensions of the cognitive framework somewhat hide the believers' ongoing connections to "this present age," or at least frames these connections ambivalently at best, and perhaps even negatively, by highlighting instead the longing for the age to come. The outlook of the framework is decidedly forward looking, though as Pesch states, "die Hoffnung in der geschehenen Erlösung gründet."[157] Indeed, both hope and suffering in this present age serve to highlight the believers' connection to the age to come. Dunn argues, "[S]uffering is part of the process…itself a sign of the wasting away of the present age," and that in the midst of the clash between the two ages "believers can be confident in the certainty (and imminence) of the eschatological climax because the work of eschatological liberation and renewal has already begun."[158] Thus the temporal dimension of the metaphors' framework accentuates the perception of temporal displacement for the believer as it highlights the temporal dimensions of belonging both to the eschatological family of God, but also continuing to exist and suffer within the present age.

3.2 Metaphor and Emotion in Romans 8

The emotive vocabulary and images in Romans 8 are so prevalent and poignant that interpreters of the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 have long noted their emotional content.[159] Moo observes, "Indeed, what Paul says here calls into question whether one can have a genuine experience of God's Spirit of adoption

---

[156] Moo, *Romans*, 510.
[157] Rudolf Pesch, *Römerbrief* (NEchtB 6, Würtzburg: Echter, 1994), 71.
[158] Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 486-87.
[159] See especially Jewett, *Romans*, 478-530; Moo, *Romans*, 499-505. Both Jewett and Moo pay particularly close attention to Paul's emotive language.

without its affecting the emotions."[160] There is much more reflection on the emotive potential of the two metaphors in Romans 8 than of the other instances of υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 9:4 and Galatians 4:5. Many themes in the passage containing the two υἱοθεσία metaphors have a strong capacity to elicit an emotional response from the audience members, including family intimacy, inheritance, suffering, groaning, slavery, redemption, hope, and glorification. As discussed earlier, a key component to understanding a metaphor is to experience the attendant emotions the metaphor creates.[161] Thus in the case of recovering the emotional content of the metaphor part of the exegetical task is to enter into the mindset of Paul's first hearers and attempt to experience and understand the emotions that they would have upon hearing the metaphors in Romans 8 for the first time. The analysis below will attempt to identify the emotions present in the text by first utilizing Booth's narrative framework and then by identifying the emotions present in the text using Kövecses' metaphors of emotion.

The narrative in Romans 8 is considerably more complex than the narrative in Galatians 4, which was examined in the previous chapter. Although Romans 8 is not typically treated as narrative, it should be recognized as a retelling of the Christ-event that highlights the relationship between the coming of Christ and the Spirit with the liberation and adoption of the believers as sons/children (υἱοί/τέκνα) of God. Beginning in verse 1, the audience is invited into a narrative world where Christ Jesus has dealt with sin and "condemned sin in the flesh (περὶ ἁμαρτίας κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί [v. 3])" for those who are "in Christ" (v. 1) and who "walk according to the Spirit (περιπατοῦσιν...κατὰ πνεῦμα [v. 4])." The narrative continues to describe the two dichotomous experiences and destinies for those who walk/exist according to the flesh, and those who walk/exist according to the Spirit (vv. 5-17).

The two endpoints of lives according to the flesh and lives according to the Spirit are in utter opposition: one leads to death (v. 6) and is hostile to God (v. 7), and the other leads to life (v. 6, 10), peace (v. 6), sonship/childship (vv. 12-17), and inheritance (v. 17). However, the narrative makes it apparent that the main characters (the audience) are among those who walk according to the Spirit, though Paul does qualify this assumption in verse 9 with the phrase "if indeed the Spirit of God dwells

[160] Moo, *Romans*, 502.
[161] See section 3.3 of chapter 3.

in you. If anyone does not have the Spirit, this one is not his" (εἴπερ πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. εἰ δέ τις πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ). However, the shift to the indefinite pronoun τις in the latter half of the verse presents the option of the Spirit not dwelling in the audience members as a hypothetical situation, as if to assure them of the opposite. Since the Spirit of God dwells in them, they can be assured that they are his.

The plural first person and second person pronouns throughout Romans 8:1-28 focus the narrative on its central characters: Paul and his audience members. Although it may seem strange to speak of the audience members as characters in a narrative, it is clear that the narrative of Romans 8 presents Paul's version of the audience members' story; he narrates the story he wants them to hear regarding the significance of their experience of life in the Spirit. Unlike the narrative in Galatians 4:1-7 where there is a clear comparison to a situation in a Greco-Roman household, Paul does not draw any analogies here, and moreover, the pronouns unambiguously refer to all of his audience members.[162] The first and second person pronouns are then modified by several descriptions which add depth to the characterization of the audience: they "walk according to the Spirit," (v. 4) they "exist according to the Spirit," (v. 5), they are "in the Spirit" (v. 9), and they are "sons," "children," and "heirs" (vv. 14-17). These descriptions are internalized by Paul's audience members, and the narrative molds them "into its limited shapes,"[163] so that they become the kind of people characterized in the narrative.

Moreover, as the audience identifies with the first and second person pronouns in the narrative they are invited to experience the tension and conflict that has resulted from experiencing the firstfruits of the Spirit and yet awaiting the final redemption of all of creation. Booth observes that when a narrative invites its readers/hearers to participate, "a large part of [the readers'] thought-stream is *taken over*, for at least the duration of the telling, by the story [they] are taking in."[164] Thus, the groaning of the characters in the narrative becomes their own groaning; the hope of those awaiting adoption becomes the audience's hope. When they accept Paul's characterization of their experience in the Spirit, the audience is led to experience the acute eschatological and existential tension of the narrative.

---

[162] For a discussion of the composition of Paul's audience see section 1.1 above.
[163] Booth, *The Company We Keep*, 204.
[164] Ibid., 141.

As the narrative progresses toward the υἱοθεσία metaphors, Paul leaves behind those who walk according to the flesh, and continues with an affirmation of sonship/childship and inheritance for those who are in the Spirit, which further confirms for the audience that Paul intends them to view themselves as participants in the latter group of people. Within this narrative, the υἱοθεσία metaphor in verse 15 functions as an image of transfer that assures the characters of the "you" and "we" (the audience) that they have crossed from existence according to the flesh to existence as sons/children who live according to the Spirit. To this assurance Paul also adds an element of conflict, or tension, in his assertion that the sons/children and co-heirs with Christ must also suffer with Christ before they are glorified with him (v. 17). This tension continues into the final section of the narrative, where the sons/children are suffering (v. 18) and groaning (v. 23) as they eagerly hope for and await the final redemption of creation (v. 21), and their own final redemption and adoption (vv. 21, 23). The υἱοθεσία metaphor in verse 23 highlights the sense of displacement the characterized audience feels as a result of their being stuck between the ages. The narrative concludes on a hopeful note, where the Spirit intercedes for the audience members and helps them in their weakness (vv. 26-27), and they are further assured that although the present time is marked by suffering, the final result will be their glorification (v. 28).

In addition to the audience as the main character in the narrative of Romans 8, Paul introduces several minor characters whose function is to bring out various elements of the main characters' narrative journey. At the beginning of the narrative Paul uses "those who walk/exist according to the flesh" as a foil for the main characters who "walk according to the Spirit" in order to highlight the disparate destinies of these two groups of people. Toward the end of the narrative, the groaning of creation functions in a similar way, augmenting the tension in the narrative and bringing the eager expectation of the audience members into sharper relief. Burke remarks, "The material order has been locked into a recurring cycle of birth and death but this present suffering is suffused with hope and its 'eyes' are firmly fixed on the outcome of what God has planned and purposed for the children of God."[165]

Unlike the narrative in Galatians 4:1-7, the Father does not play a major role in the narrative in Romans 8. Rather, the figure of the Father looms offstage, implied

[165] Burke, "Adopted as Sons," 283.

in Paul's use of sonship language, but only explicitly referenced in the cry αββα ὁ πατήρ in verse 15. The Son takes on a much greater role in the narrative in Romans 8, and in the υἱοθεσία metaphor in 8:15 in particular. Paul presents the sonship of the audience as integrally linked with the experience of the Son; the co-heirs are also co-sufferers and are co-glorified. Thus the tension that the characterized audience experiences in verses 18-23 takes on a christological focus, as their sufferings of this present time are colored by the sufferings of the Son in verse 17.

The role of the Spirit is the most prominent of the three members of the Trinity in Romans 8, and interestingly, undergoes the most transformation as the narrative progresses. In the opening of the narrative the characterization is rather flat and abstract, as the Spirit is described largely in antithetical terms to the "flesh." However, in verse 11 the Spirit begins to take a more active role, being identified both as the Spirit of the one who raised Jesus from the dead (τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐγείραντος τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐκ νεκρῶν) and the Spirit who dwells in "you" (οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν). The character of the Spirit is further developed through his involvement in the υἱοθεσία metaphor, where the Spirit enables the cry αββα ὁ πατήρ and co-testifies that the audience members are children of God (vv. 15-17). The narrative also attributes the inward groaning of the believers to the presence of the Spirit (v. 23), and even more poignantly, the Spirit helps and intercedes for the audience as they await the culmination of God's redemptive action (vv. 26-27).

Through the narrative framework and the various characters in Romans 8, Paul invites the audience members to participate in the story and identify with the experiences of its characters. Because the narrative utilizes an abundance of plural first and second person pronouns, the audience is undoubtedly led to identify most closely with Paul's characterization of them in the text. The minor characters of the narrative complement the story of the main character, bringing the experience of the characterized audience members into sharper relief. Thus the primary focus below will be to identify the emotions of the main character of the narrative (the audience) that are present within the diptych of the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8, as these emotions were the ones most likely elicited by the text and experienced by Paul's flesh-and-blood audience members as the letter was read.

There are several punctiliar instances of metaphors of emotion which crop up at various places in the narrative, such as the believers' cry αββα ὁ πατήρ invoking, "EMOTION IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER,"[166] and the labor pains of creation and the groans of the believer combining the conceptual metaphors "EMOTION IS A PHYSICAL FORCE," with "INTERNAL IS EXTERNAL."[167] However, these punctiliar instances of conceptual metaphors build upon three primary conceptual metaphors that work together to elicit a particular emotional response from Paul's audience. Using Kövecses' categories, the contours of the emotions Paul presents in the context of the υἱοθεσία diptych broadly correspond to emotions generally characterized as "UP" and those generally characterized as "DOWN." Presented side-by-side, these two conceptual metaphors create tension between the "upward" and "downward" emotion, which is then expressed by a third metaphor: "EMOTION IS A BURDEN." As the narrative progresses, the audience members also experience the tension in these various emotions, and are themselves burdened by the unresolved tension in the context of the υἱοθεσία metaphors.

The presence of the "DOWN" emotions begins with the negative portrayal of the "flesh" in verses 12-13 and the accompanying image of slavery in verse 15, which is specifically labeled with the emotion "fear." Broadly, these images rely on the metaphor "BAD THINGS ARE DOWN."[168] More specifically, Paul's use of ὀφειλέτης, θανάτοω, and δουλεία connote various degrees of oppression or weight, which according to Kövecses also employs the metaphor "EMOTION IS A BURDEN."[169] According to Kövecses, "the external pressure caused by the burden (Antagonist) on the body-container (Agonist) corresponds to the stress or difficulty caused by the emotion (Antagonist) on the self (Agonist)."[170] In Romans 8:12-15, Paul's presentation of the flesh and its corresponding "EMOTION IS A BURDEN" acts as a foil to highlight the "unburdening" of the believers who receive the spirit of adoption in verse 15. The "BAD THINGS ARE DOWN" images of flesh, slavery, and death are then contrasted with sonship (v. 15), where the result is glorification (v. 17). Here Paul's

[166] Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion*, 77.
[167] Ibid., 83-86.
[168] Ibid., 44.
[169] Ibid., 82-83.
[170] Ibid., 82.

use of δοξάζω implies an upward trajectory, and according to Kövecses' theory, "GOOD THINGS ARE UP."[171]

However, it is also clear in the narrative that the audience is not yet fully experiencing their adoption, redemption, or glorification, and thus the "GOOD THINGS ARE UP" emotions are held in tension with the "BAD THINGS ARE DOWN." This is particularly apparent in Paul's juxtaposition in verse 18 between "suffering (πάθημα)," which is the present reality, and the "glory (δόξα)" which is on the brink of being revealed.[172] The tension between these two emotional experiences manifests itself further in the context of the second υἱοθεσία metaphor, where Paul's use of στενάζω and ἀπεκδέχομαι again speaks of these emotions as forces or burdens acting upon the audience, one implying a craning forward in eager expectation (ἀπεκδέχομαι),[173] and one implying a weighing down (στενάζω). Of στενάζω Schneider writes, "Sighing takes place *by reason of a condition of oppression under which man suffers* and from which he longs to be free."[174] Thus the picture Paul sketches for his audience is one where they are straining forward for the final consummation of their adoption under the weight of the sufferings that are endemic to the present age.[175] As the audience is bombarded with these conflicting downward and upward emotions, they are invited to express the weight of this tension through groaning and sighing as they await its resolution.

As I have shown, the metaphors in Romans 8 invite the audience to experience the tension of conflicting emotional responses, which result in a profound sense of existential tension and displacement. Emerson Powery states, "Groans imply disorder. Praise implies awareness of God's sovereignty….These dimensions of prayer (i.e., the groan and the praise) are signs of the 'hope' *and* the 'suffering' of those in whom the Spirit of God dwells."[176] Drawing on the "upward" conceptual metaphor, the feelings of hope and assurance are rooted in the believers' awareness of their new status as

---

[171] Ibid., 44.
[172] Although δόξα is closely connected with the "weightiness" of God in the OT (e.g. Exod 19:16; 1 Sam 4:21-22), כבוד also can be used to refer to the exaltation of God "far above the sphere of natural phenomena" (*TNDT*, 2: 240), as in Psalm 19. Thus the idea of "weightiness" is still combined with an upward orientation in its conceptual framework.
[173] *TDNT*, 2:56.
[174] J. Schneider, "στενάζω, στεναγμός, συστενάζω," in *TDNT*, 7: 601 (emph. mine).
[175] Michel Quesnel also expresses this tension well, "L'anticipation de la gloire est une consequence de l'anticipation de la mort" ("La Figure de la Mort Dans L'Épître aux Romains: Fonction Rhétorique et Argumentative," in *The Letter to the Romans*, ed. Udo Schnelle (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 70.
[176] Emerson Powery, "'The Groans of 'Brother Saul': An Exploratory Reading of Romans 8 for 'Survival," *WW* 24.3 (2004): 322 (emph. orig.).

adopted sons that will result in their coming glory. The assurance of the upward trajectory is further seen in the emotional response evoked by the υἱοθεσία metaphor, where the believer cries out αββα ὁ πατήρ in recognition of his or her transfer into the family of God.

However, alongside the believers' emotional experience of "upward" looking concepts, such as hope and assurance of their identity as adopted sons of God, the believers also experience the "downward" emotions that come with the suffering and currently unfulfilled longing for complete redemption. As a result, the believers experience acute existential tension, which arises from the perception that they exist simultaneously κατὰ πνεῦμα and also are suffering and groaning with all of creation as they await God's final act of adoption. As Dillon states, "The travails of God's children are the inevitable consequence of their new obedience, which locks them into a state of gnawing, propulsive dissatisfaction."[177] The vocabulary surrounding the υἱοθεσία metaphor in 8:23 is laden with tension, angst, and longing. The future and upward orientation of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in verse 23 draws these emotions of groaning and longing to the surface for Paul's audience, also making them acutely aware of the eschatological tension in which they have come to exist through their adoption to sonship. As Kraftchick aptly observes, "Paul believes in the coming resolution, but he resides in the present ambiguity."[178] Thus, the emotional content evoked by the two υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 expresses the existential tension of the present ambiguity, and gives the believers a space to groan under an intense emotional burden for God's final action, while they simultaneously rest in the assurance of their identity as sons of God.

3.3 Metaphor and Community in Romans 8

As a framework for structuring the perception of Paul's audience members, the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 are quite conducive to fostering intimacy and creating a sense of familial identity between hearers of the metaphor. I have already discussed some of the possible effects the υἱοθεσία metaphors might have had on the perception and emotion of its hearers, and in this section I will aim to illuminate the effect the metaphors' cognitive framework and emotional content might have had on

[177] Richard Dillon, "The Spirit as Taskmaster," *CBQ* 60.4 (1998): 700.
[178] Steven Kraftchick, "Paul's Use of Creation Themes: A Test of Romans 1-8," *ExAud* 3 (1987): 87.

how the members of Paul's community perceive their relationships to one another. I will also utilize the analysis from past sections to posit what sense of community identity Paul's audience might have derived from the metaphors. I will argue below that in Romans 8 Paul is able to create feelings of intimacy by overlaying a shared experience (the reception of the Spirit) with a framework of familial relationships (υἱοθεσία). This creation of intimacy leads to the construction of a community identity by creating a "sameness of vision" among the hearers of the metaphor in regard to how they understand their relationships to God, to one another, and to outsiders.

3.3.1 Creation of Intimacy

Though the feelings of intimacy a metaphor creates need not necessarily be characterized by feelings of emotional closeness or caring,[179] this kind of intimacy is in view in Romans 8. This is particularly evident in the '*abbā* cry, where Moo articulates, "[O]ur adoption as sons affects the deepest and innermost parts of our beings."[180] In addition, the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 also achieve feelings of intimacy created by the "sameness of vision" that the metaphors engender when the audience members choose to participate in seeing its subject from a shared point of view with the author.[181] In Romans 8, this sameness of vision is the mutual recognition between members of the community that they see *X* through the same framework. In addition, while metaphors usually create intimacy between the author and audience and between audience members, it is difficult to distinguish clearly between these two cultivations in Romans 8. Paul switches freely between first person and second person plural forms throughout Romans 8, and frames the discussion through shared kinship terms like ἀδελφοί, υἱοί, τέκνα,

One of the most powerful creators of intimacy in the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 is that their sameness of vision directs the audience to view other members of the community as members of the same family of adopted sons. Although metaphorical designations of kinship did not necessarily imply a close relationship or a strong bond between designees,[182] Paul's use of familial designations in Romans 8

[179] See section 3.1 of chapter 3; see also William Horton, "Metaphor and Readers' Attributions of Intimacy," 89; Gaventa, *Our Mother St. Paul*, 12.
[180] Moo, *Romans*, 504.
[181] Cohen, *Thinking of Others*, 22-24.
[182] See Trebilco, *Self-Designations*, 18.

draws attention to the "emotional intensity" of the chapter's content,[183] and reminds the believers of their "common knowledge" which "reinforces the sense that they belong to a group of brothers and sisters who are different from outsiders."[184] The sameness of vision looks inward at other community members rather than at outsiders; it is self-reflective. The mutual recognition achieved by the metaphors is thus the mutual recognition of the shared status of sonship. The believers also share the mutual experience of crying out to αββα ὁ πατήρ, which binds them together by creating a sameness of vision around their relationship to the Father. Jewett argues, "The confirmation of this extraordinarily high status [sonship of God] granted to believers is drawn from the widely shared experience of charismatic language [the Abba cry]."[185] Through this shared experience as adopted sons, believers of diverse ethnic origins, gender, and social status share in this intimate and emotional heart cry together, maximizing their interpersonal bonds and minimizing their perceived differences.

While it is not perhaps the dominant means through which intimacy is cultivated, the believers also share in the mutual recognition and sameness of vision of their state as adopted children caught between the "already" and "not yet" of the two ages. Schlier observes, "Die Gegenwart – und das ist für ihn die Zeit zwischen Jesu christi Sterben und Auferstehen einerseits und seiner offenbaren Ankunft in Herrlichkeit – ist voller Leiden."[186] The profound sense of temporal and existential displacement created by the tension between the two υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 cultivates a sense of intimacy between community members as they recognize their shared experience of suffering and existential unrest brought into existence through the Christ-event. This intimacy results not only from the shared experience itself,[187] but also from members of the group coming to the realization that they share this "sameness of vision." Thus the metaphor cultivates the bonds of intimacy by drawing upon the perception of temporal displacement and directing the attention of

---

[183] Ibid., 25-26.
[184] Ibid., 26-27.
[185] Jewett, *Romans*, 498
[186] Schlier, *Römerbrief*, 257.
[187] This might be classified as a "joint activity" under Clark's understanding. Of joint activities, Clark remarks, "As individuals, we have an intuitive feeling for what we do and don't know, even when we cannot recall a piece of information at the moment….[W]e also have an intuitive feeling about what others know, which we might call *feeling of others' knowing*, and it too is often very accurate" (*Using Language*, 111 [emph. orig.]).

community members horizontally to recognize this as an experience held in common by all other members of the community.

3.3.2 Creation of Identity

In chapter three I argued that the metaphors of the New Testament were not only powerful tools for communicating theological content but that they also give voice to the shared experiences of members of the early Christian communities.[188] This is perhaps particularly true of the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8, where adoption—an inherently relational metaphor—is set within a highly relational and community-oriented context (the communal experience of receiving the Spirit). There are a number of facets of identity formation that the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 potentially influenced including: the self-understanding of community members as participants in the new reality inaugurated in the Christ-event, the interpersonal relationships of community members relating as adopted members of the same fictive family, and the solidarity with the groaning creation that is reinforced by linking their adoption to suffering and longing. In this context, the υἱοθεσία metaphor provides a structure through which the community can process its interpersonal relationships with one another, its relationship to those who remain outside of the community boundaries, and, to some extent, even its place in time and history.

Above I argued that the υἱοθεσία metaphors provide a cognitive framework which provides a structure for the shared experience of the reception of the Spirit. This reception of the Spirit unites the community members to Christ and to one another as "people who are led by the Spirit." Moreover, Paul's inclusion of the flesh/Spirit dichotomy also forms a barrier around the community members by distinguishing them from outsiders who are "in the flesh."[189] Through the framework of υἱοθεσία, the believers connect their experience of the Spirit with entrance into the community of believers, the community of those who belong to Christ (8:9). Furthermore, Paul solidifies not only the existence of this new mode of being (in the Spirit), but also undergirds the sense of community identity by enlisting the audience as active participants in their new family. Tonstad writes, "[T]he recipients of the letter are enlisted as codeclarers and coannouncers of the new reality. Their

[188] See section 3.2 of chapter 3.
[189] See also Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 488; Schreiner, *Romans*, 410-14.

participation in this task is nowhere more evident than in their cry, 'Abba! Father!'"[190] By drawing the audience members into the text and encouraging them to actively participate in declaring their adoption, Paul is able to further solidify the self-understanding of the community members as the adopted children of God.

The υἱοθεσία metaphors create and communicate a paradigm of fictive kinship for the interpersonal relatedness between community members. Moreover, unlike, for example, new birth metaphors, the υἱοθεσία metaphors create kinship bonds that supersede, but do not eliminate, ethnic distinctions.[191] The underlying model of υἱοθεσία evokes associations of an adult son being transferred from one family to another. Although these sons assume a new *paterfamilias* and a new family identity, the process of adoption does not imply an ontological transformation of essence in the same way as does a metaphor of new birth. Rather, υἱοθεσία as a framework implies the continuity of personhood and identity for individuals when they are transferred into the new *familia*. Thus, the framework of υἱοθεσία is particularly well-suited to creating a unifying identity for the diverse members of Paul's audience, while also affirming the presence of diversity. As Jewett observes, "In the context of Romans, at least, being 'saved' did not entail cultural or theological extinction. It involved preserving distinctive features of racial, cultural, and theological self-identity within the context of mutual acceptance."[192] Thus the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 function as a fixed symbol of community identity, marking out the members of the community as members of the same adoptive family, but yet the image is fluid and inclusive enough to affirm the ongoing differences between community members.

In Romans 8, the believers' separation from the world is held in tension with their suffering and solidarity with it. This dialectic created by the two υἱοθεσία metaphors is another powerful force for the construction of the identity and self-understanding of Paul's audience. Beker observes that in Romans 8, "the picture of the church *against* and *separated from* the world is here juxtaposed by a picture of the church *for* the world, i.e., by a Church in solidarity with the world and its

---

[190] Tonstad, "Revisionary Potential," 6.
[191] See also Beker, "The Faithfulness of God," 10-16.
[192] Robert Jewett, "The Law and the Coexistence of Jews and Gentiles in Romans," *Int* 39.4 (1985): 354.

suffering."[193] The close identification of υἱοθεσία with the suffering of believers both as co-sufferers with Christ and as those who groan in solidarity with creation results in the construction of a community whose identity is grounded in empathic suffering. As Gaventa remarks, "There is here a unity of everything in its createdness and in its relationship to God."[194] Moreover, while the believers understand their adoption in the context of suffering, the metaphor also lends itself well to viewing those outside the community as other potential adopted brothers and sisters. The metaphor frames adoption as something God extends to his sons through the reception of the Spirit, and thus the community boundary retains at least some level of fluidity so that new brothers and sisters can be included.[195]

Connecting adoption to the believers' experience of suffering and to their communal groaning for God's eschatological action also forges a sense of community identity around the experience of temporal displacement among community members. Here especially the performative nature of a metaphorical utterance is essential to the construction of this boundary,[196] as tension between the two metaphors creates and intensifies the profound feeling of existential tension resulting from Paul's paradoxical "already-but-not-yet" temporal framework.[197] Indeed, it is hard to imagine an element that would be more useful in constructing a sense of community identity than to create the impression that community members belong to a separate age than their surrounding culture. In Romans 8 Paul succeeds in creating a sameness of vision among his audience for how they perceive something as fundamental as time. Bound together as a community of adopted sons, the believers' identity is closely tied to their shared sense of temporal displacement, of which they were made aware by the reception of the Spirit.

4. Conclusion

The two υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 are part of a complex and multifaceted description of the believers' relationship to the Triune God and to one another. The imagery is so evocative that it leads Moo to conclude, "Paul's

[193] Beker, "Suffering and Triumph," 110 (emph. orig.).
[194] Gaventa, "Neither Height nor Depth," 277.
[195] See also ibid., 267.
[196] See section 3.2.2 of chapter 3; see also Asano, *Community-Identity Construction*, 39; Zhang, "Corporate Identity Metaphor," 388.
[197] Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 487-91.

description of the Spirit's work in conferring sonship forms one of the most beautiful pictures of the believer's joy and security anywhere in Scripture."[198] In terms of its textual features, I identified that 8:15 and 8:23 are two distinct metaphorical utterances, but argued that they each comprise part of a diptych in the frame that stretches from 8:12-25. Using Soskice's definition,[199] I argued that the υἱοθεσία metaphor in verse 15 should be rendered, "speaking about the initiation of God's relationship with the believer and his or her entrance into the community of believers in terms which are seen to be suggestive of adoption." Under this construal, the υἱοθεσία metaphor speaks not only to soteriology, but also has a profound effect on how the believers understand their relationships to one another (ecclesiology). Likewise using Soskice's framework, the υἱοθεσία metaphor in verse 23 would read, "speaking about God's eschatological action toward believers (and the believers' anticipation of those actions) in terms which are seen to be suggestive of adoption." When combined, the two υἱοθεσία metaphors tie together the complex dialectics between slavery and sonship, and between suffering and hope, with adoption to sonship forming an emphatic and resonant focal point for the entire passage.

Moving beyond the confines of the text, I also argued that, as in Galatians 4:5, the two metaphors closely link υἱοθεσία to the believers' experience of receiving the Spirit, providing a familial cognitive framework through which the believer understands his or her new existence in the Spirit. However, unlike in Galatians 4:1-7, the two υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 draw attention to the acute existential and eschatological tension that has accompanied the audience's experience of the Spirit. Furthermore, drawn from the complex themes in the text, the cognitive framework constructed by the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 is likewise complex, containing vertical, horizontal, and temporal dimensions. In a similar fashion to the role of each member of the Trinity in Galatians 4:5, the framework of the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 creates the perception of the Father as the initiator of adoption, the Spirit as the witness, and the Son as their elder brother and co-heir. Thus the framework created by υἱοθεσία highlights the involvement of the whole Trinity in bringing the believer into the intimate relationship of sonship.

---

[198] Moo, *Romans*, 499.

[199] "That figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another" (Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15).

I also showed that the cognitive framework created by the two υἱοθεσία metaphors draws attention to the horizontal relationships between community members, perhaps minimizing the importance of ethnic or social distinctions between them. Whereas the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 rooted the community identity in the sonship of believers in Christ and in faith rather than in Abraham and law observance, the metaphors in Romans 8 highlight the common bonds of community members as brothers and sisters who are co-sufferers in this present age. In Romans 8, the believers as members of one family are joined together as co-heirs, co-sufferers, and co-participants in glorification with Christ, and I argued that their solidarity with Christ likely also produced feelings of solidarity toward one another as brothers and sisters. Moreover, I contended that the temporal dimensions of the cognitive structure in Romans 8 created the perception of acute displacement for the believers, which likely contributed significantly to the cultivation of intimacy between community members by highlighting their shared existence as people "caught between" the tension of the two ages. This sameness of vision is seen most clearly in the communal groaning of the believers as they await God's final eschatological restoration. Because the two υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 draw on the experience of the believers and provide a familial framework through which to interpret their life as part of the community, they must be recognized as powerful agents in forming and reforming the perceptions, emotions, and identity of the Christians in Rome.

VII. TO WHOM BELONGS THE ADOPTION: THE ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ METAPHOR IN ROMANS 9:4

1. INTRODUCTION

It is most certainly beyond the scope of this study to give a comprehensive argument for the place Paul imagines for Israel in Romans 9-11.[1] Rather, here I must restrict myself to an examination of the literary construction and the cognitive and affective potential of υἱοθεσία as it appears in its context as one of the privileges Paul designates as belonging to the Israelites (Romans 9:4). However, an interpreter's understanding of "Israel" in Romans 9-11 often informs and, to some degree, determines his or her exegetical conclusions. As Wolfgang Reinbold argues, one of the chief interpretive difficulties faced in Romans 9-11 is determining, "von wem Paulus spricht, wenn er 'Israel' sagt."[2] Therefore, a few words of clarification are warranted. First, I take Romans 9-11 to be an integral component to Paul's argument,[3] not an unrelated excurses or tangent.[4] Second, I will take seriously the ethnic component of οἵτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται and treat Romans 9:1-5 as the list of historic privileges God has bestowed upon the nation of Israel as an ethnic, political, and religious entity.[5] Moreover, as Gaventa observes, to ask about Israel as an ethnic, political, and religious entity "is necessarily to ask about *God and Israel*, since Paul

---

[1] For a good survey of the history of interpretive approaches to Romans 9-11 see Klaus Haacker, "Das Thema von Römer 9-11 als Problem der Auslegungsgeschichte," in *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 55-72; Mark Reasoner, "Romans 9-11 Moves from Margin to Center, from Rejection to Salvation: Four Grids for Recent English-Language Exegesis," in *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 73-89; J. N. Aletti, *Israël et la loi dans la lettre aux romains* (Paris: Cerf, 1998).

[2] Wolfgang Reinbold, "Zur Bedeutung des Begriffes 'Israel' in Römer 9-11," in *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 401; see also Michael Wolter, "Das Israelprobleme nach Gal 4,21-31 und Röm 9-11," *ZTK* 107 (2010): 1-30.

[3] For a good defense of the thematic integration of Romans 9-11 with Romans 1-8 and 12-16 see Cristoph Stenschke, "Römer 9-11 als Teil des Römerbriefs," in *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 197-225.

[4] So e.g. C. H. Dodd who claims "the epistle without any sense of gap if these chapters were omitted" (*The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* [MNTC, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932], 149.

[5] See Susan Grove Eastman for an excellent analysis of Paul's use of "Israelite" as a designation for ethnic Jews ("Israel and the Mercy of God: A Re-reading of Galatians 6.16 and Romans 9-11," *NTS* 56 [2010]: 367-95); see also Reinhold, "Zur Bedeutung des Begriffes 'Israel,'" 408-409; for a reflection on the historical ramifications of Paul's assertions regarding Israel in Romans 9:1-5 see Heinz Kremers, "Das jüdische Volk ist noch immer "Israel" – Volk Gottes: Eine Auslegung von Röm 9,1-5," in *Mission an Israel in heilsgeschichtlicher Sicht*, eds. Heinz Kremers, and Erich Lubahn (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985), 37-48.

writes nothing about an Israel that can be isolated as an ethnic entity or a 'nation,' but only as God's creation in each patriarchal generation."[6] Furthermore, I take Paul's words in verses 1-3 to be a lament over his kinsfolk's failure to recognize Jesus as the Messiah of Israel, and that Paul's desire to be "anathema" from Christ implies that he believes this to be the status of many of his kinsfolk.[7]

The question Paul answers in Romans 9-11 is not to do with Israel and the Church as has at times been supposed, but rather Paul's question pertains solely to Israel and the faithfulness of God to his promises.[8] Dunn aptly says, "[T]he sole entity in view is Israel itself, the definition of Israel and membership of Israel, who and how the branches of the olive tree of Israel (11:17-24) are constituted."[9] In light of these considerations, my primary task here is to explore how Paul uses and interprets these historic privileges of Israel, and υἱοθεσία specifically, in his own wrestling with the question of God's faithfulness to his covenant with his chosen people.

2. Metaphor and Text

2.1 The Metaphorical Utterance

Unlike the metaphorical utterance in Romans 8:15 where Paul fleshes out and develops the metaphor in considerable detail, the metaphorical utterance containing υἱοθεσία in Romans 9 exists as a predication without explanation, and as one among many others in a list of privileges belonging to the Israelites. Indeed the argument could be made that since Paul does not elaborate upon υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4, it is a rather minor component in his summary of Israel's ongoing relationship with YHWH.

---

[6] Beverly Roberts Gaventa, "On the Calling-Into-Being of Israel: Romans 9:6-29," in *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 257 (emph. orig.).

[7] *Pace* Stowers who sees the list of privileges as further confirmation that Romans was written to an exclusively gentile audience, and that "Jews still possess the kind of relation to God which 1:20-32 says that the gentiles have lost" (*A Rereading of Romans*, 129; see also 129-34). Hodge's analysis of Romans 9-11 is based on a similar argument. She states, "The content of the good news is the same for the Jews and Greeks, but what it means for each group differs.…The relevance of this good news for the *Ioudaioi*, who already have these things that the gentiles have recently gained, is that it signals arrival of the awaited time. Through Christ, the nations are coming to Israel" (*If Sons, Then Heirs*, 139).

[8] See Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 2, 517-21 for an excellent explanation of Paul's argument in Romans 9-11. See also Bruce W. Longenecker, "Different Answers to Different Issues: Israel, the Gentiles and Salvation History in Romans 9-11," *JSNT* 36 (1989): 95-123.

[9] James D. G. Dunn, "Did Paul Have a Covenant Theology?: Reflections of Romans 9:4 and 11:27," in *Celebrating Romans: Template for Pauline Theology*, ed. Sheila E. McGinn (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 16.

Furthermore, υἱοθεσία might have been chosen for purely stylistic reasons, in order to maintain the assonance between the –ία endings of the other privileges Paul lists.[10] However, since Paul has used υἱοθεσία twice in prominent places in the preceding passage, the concept "adoption" is already fixed in his audience's mind when he mentions it again in 9:4, perhaps suggesting that it had the potential to make a significant contribution to shaping the audience's perception of Israel.

Recall from the second chapter that metaphorical meaning is determined at the level of an utterance rather than a lexeme. Therefore the significantly different content of the phrase in which υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4 appears will have a significant impact on the meaning of the metaphorical utterance. While the metaphor's vehicle remains the same (υἱοθεσία), in Romans 9:4 the metaphor's tenor has shifted from the believers' relationship to God in Romans 8:15 and 8:23 to the Israelite's relationship with God. Since we must consider the interanimation of the tenor and vehicle in determining the meaning of the metaphorical utterance, we should anticipate that a change in the metaphor's tenor will produce a different set of implications than the metaphorical utterances in Romans 8 where a different tenor is present. Furthermore, the metaphor in Romans 9:4 picks out a different referent (Israelites) and this too potentially changes the implications of the metaphor. In light of these considerations, we first must identify the metaphorical utterance in order to explain the interanimation of its tenor and vehicle.[11]

In Romans 9:4 the metaphor consists of the phrase "They are Israelites, to whom [belongs] the adoption" (οἵτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται, ὧν ἡ υἱοθεσία). The metaphor occurs in the midst of a larger list of privileges (the glory, the covenants, the giving of the Law, the worship, the promises, the patriarchs, and the Messiah according to ethnicity).[12] This list, in turn, belongs to the larger block of text, Romans 9:1-5. In the preceding verses we find that Paul is in agony over the state of his

---

[10] The presence of atypical terms in this list has led some to conclude that Paul has appropriated a traditional list from a Hellenistic Jewish source (see Otto Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 4th ed. [KEK, Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1966], 228; Calvin Roetzel, "Διαθῆκαι in Romans 9:4," *Bib* 51 [1970]: 388). However, Pauline authorship is to be preferred since parallel lists of privileges are lacking in other Jewish literature (see John Piper, *The Future of Justification* [Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2007], 6-7; Schreiner, *Romans*, 483). For a good explanation of Paul's form and style in 9:4, see Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 2, 526; Folker Siegert, *Argumentation bei Paulus: gezeigt an Röm 9-11* (WUNT 34, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985), 122.

[11] For a fuller explanation of the interanimation theory of metaphor see section 2.3 of chapter 2; see also Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 43-53.

[12] οἵτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται, ὧν ἡ υἱοθεσία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ αἱ διαθῆκαι καὶ ἡ νομοθεσία καὶ ἡ λατρεία καὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι, ὧν οἱ πατέρες καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα (Rom 9:4).

kinsfolk, those who are Israelites according to the flesh. It is also widely recognized that these verses serve as an introduction to Paul's thesis statement in verse 6, "it is not as though the word of God had failed" (Οὐχ οἷον δὲ ὅτι ἐκπέπτωκεν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ), which he then qualifies with the assertion "for not all [who descended] from Israel are Israel" (οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ).[13] Regarding verse 6b, Gaventa argues that the sense of the text is not that Paul envisions an Israel within Israel, but rather that "the entity known as 'Israel' is not and never has been defined by birth but only by God's creation; it is not a biological but a theological category."[14] Moreover, although verse 6 functions as the thesis statement of the passage, it cannot be separated from the list of privileges in verses 4-5 which remind the audience of God's actions in Israel's history. Paul's preamble in verses 1-5 thus serves as a framework that introduces Paul's thesis in verse 6, and provides the foundation for the whole of chapters 9-11.[15]

Interestingly, of the list of privileges Paul gives here, υἱοθεσία is the only metaphorical predication among them.[16] Recall from the first chapter that I am defining a metaphor as "that figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another."[17] Here then, we have Israel's relationship with God spoken about in terms seen to be suggestive of υἱοθεσία. Though the other privileges in the list are non-metaphorical, this utterance should be taken as metaphorical for several reasons. First, as a description, υἱοθεσία does not exhaust the complexities of God's covenant relationship with Israel, which we would expect if υἱοθεσία were a non-metaphorical term used to refer to the covenant

---

[13] E.g. Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 2, 518; Brian J. Abasciano, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9.1-9: An Intertextual and Theological Exegesis* (LNTS 301, London: T & T Clark, 2005), 180. For a detailed argument for the possibility of 9:6 being inclusive of all Israel see Michael Cranford, "Election and Ethnicity: Paul's View of Israel in Romans 9:1-13," *JSNT* 50 (1993): 27-41; for an alternative view see Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, "'Nicht alle aus Israel sind Israel' (Röm 9,6b): Römer 9-11 als Zeugnis paulinischer Anthropologie," in *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilks, and J. Ross Wagner (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 433-62.

[14] Gaventa, "On the Calling-Into-Being of Israel," 259.

[15] I will explore this possibility in greater detail below (see esp. section 2.4).

[16] Paul's reference to "the glory" (ἡ δόξα) is the only other possible exception, in which case Paul would be speaking of God's presence in terms which are seen to be suggestive of glory. However, it is arguable that this metaphor has become so common (e.g. Exod 16:7-10; 24:16-17; Lev 9:6; Num 14:10; 16:19; Deut 5:24; 1 Sam 4:21-22; 1 Kgs 8:11; 2 Chr 5:14; 7:1-3; Ps 97:6; 102:15-16; Isa 4:5; 6:3; 40:5; 60:1; Ezek 1:28; 3:12, 23; 8:4; 9:3; 10:4-19; 11:22-23; 43:2-5; Hab 3:3; Sir 49:8; Bar 5:6-9; 2 Macc 2:8) that it should be classified as a "dead" metaphor. For further discussion on living and dead metaphors see section 2.3.4 of chapter 2.

[17] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15. For a full explanation of the merits of Soskice's definition, see section 2.3 of chapter 2.

relationship.[18] However, what we see both in the Old Testament and here in Paul's argument are multiple descriptions of the relationship between God and the Israelites. For example, in the Old Testament Israel is described not only as the firstborn son of YHWH (e.g. Exod 4:22),[19] but also in terms seen to be suggestive of a wife (Hos 2:2-3), a whore (Hos 2:4-5), as sheep of a shepherd (Ezek 34:11-16), and many others. Moreover, in the course of Romans 9-11, Paul speaks of Israel as clay in the potter's hand (9:20-22), dough (11:16), and branches of an olive tree (11:17-24).

Both the Pauline and Old Testament metaphors utilize a particular vehicle (son, wife, whore, branches, etc.), to speak of Israel's covenant relationship in terms which are seen to be suggestive of this vehicle. Where some vehicles lend themselves more easily to the recognition of the presence of a metaphor (perhaps "branches," "sheep," and "clay"), it seems that when vehicles that can also refer to humans or human relationships are used there is more reluctance to label the utterance as "metaphorical." Perhaps, then, in order to demonstrate that these utterances *must* be metaphorical we need only note that Israel cannot both be "son" and "wife" to YHWH. Indeed, properly speaking a nation lacks the capacity to be either, since it is not a person. However, as metaphors these two utterances each describe the covenant relationship with YHWH in ways that the other lacks, and neither metaphor provides us with a complete picture of Israel's covenant relationship with YHWH. What we should conclude from these diverse descriptions in Scripture is that, as McFague notes, "*many* metaphors and models are necessary, that a piling up of images is essential…to attempt to express the richness and variety of the divine-human relationship."[20] The many and varied descriptions of the covenant relationship each produce a slightly different cognitive structure and affective result for the audience, and they are not interchangeable.[21] Furthermore, if υἱοθεσία here is a description of the covenant relationship, then we must recognize also that this description is *Paul's own description* of the multifaceted covenant relationship, and that Paul had other

[18] The unique intertexual issue raised by Paul's peculiar use of υἱοθεσία, which occurs nowhere in the LXX, will be discussed in more detail below.
[19] This is not to say that the "sonship" metaphors of the Old Testament and intertestamental literature are the same metaphor that Paul is using here. The intertextual relationship between Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor and the sonship metaphor tradition is not nearly as straightforward as has often been assumed by scholars; *pace* Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 81-84; Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 148-49.
[20] McFague, *Metaphorical Theology*, 20 (emph. orig.).
[21] I will argue in greater detail that Israel's covenant relationship with YHWH is the most likely candidate for the tenor of the metaphor in the following section.

descriptions available (e.g. "firstborn son" ὁ πρωτότοκος, or perhaps even "the election" ἡ ἐκλογή).[22] Indeed, other descriptions at Paul's disposal were more well-worn and familiar to both him and his audience, making his choice of υἱοθεσία all the more striking.

Furthermore, the rest of the terms in Paul's list of privileges directly refer to either a historical event or a concrete object. Unlike υἱοθεσία, which makes a reference to God's covenant relationship with Israel by speaking of it in terms which are seen to be suggestive of something else—i.e. adoption—each of the other privileges speaks of its subject directly. We can connect "the glory" to the glory of God's presence (כבד) that appeared to the Israelites several times during the exodus events (e.g. Exod 16:10; 24:15-17) and then resided in the tabernacle (Exod 29:43; 40:34-35; Lev 9:23; Num 14:10) and then in the temple (2 Chr 5:14; 7:1). The plural covenants (αἱ διαθῆκαι) might refer to all of the various covenants between YHWH and Israel in the Old Testament (e.g. the covenants with Abraham: Gen 15, 17; with Moses: Exod 19:5-6; with David: 2 Sam 23:5), or it might point to the trajectory of the single Abrahamic covenant. Dunn asserts, "the covenant given to Abraham and renewed to Isaac and Jacob…that is, the covenant(s) with the fathers."[23] The giving of the Law (νομοθεσία) is certainly a reference to the Mosaic Law, though whether νομοθεσία is taken actively to mean "the giving of the Law on Mt. Sinai," or passively to mean their possession of the collection of "God-given" Law perhaps attempts too fine a distinction where one is unwarranted.[24] Paul's reference to "the worship" (ἡ λατρεία) likely refers to the cultic observance and the sacrificial system (e.g. Exod 12:25-26; Josh 21:27 LXX; 1 Chr 28:13). Like the covenants, the reference to "the promises" (ἡ επαγγελίαι) recalls Paul's earlier mentions of YHWH's promises to Abraham regarding his inheritance (land) and offspring (Gen 12:2-9; 15:5-7; 17:4-8; Rom 4:1, 13, 16-17). The final parallel term in the list, "the patriarchs" (οἱ πατέρες), again recalls Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to whom YHWH promises

---

[22] Paul may have chosen υἱοθεσία rather than πρωτότοκος purely for stylistic reasons, but one cannot help think that if he had wanted to maintain Israel's traditional designation as "firstborn son" he might have chosen to phrase things differently. The "election" at least is feminine, though use of the plural to create the desired assonance with the other terms admittedly would make little sense.

[23] Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 2, 527.

[24] For the former view see Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 2, 463, Eldon Epp, "Jewish-Gentile Continuity in Paul: Torah and/or Faith? (Romans 9:1-5)," *HTR* 79 (1986): 89; and *TDNT*, 4:1089; for the latter view see Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 546 and Byrne, *Romans*, 287. Fitzmyer and Byrne cite 2 Macc 6:23; 4 Macc 5:35; 17:16 as examples of νομοθεσία as the result rather than the act of law-giving.

covenant blessing for them and their descendants. The last privilege Paul mentions in a separate clause is the ethnic descent of the Messiah, who is "from them according to the flesh" (ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα).[25]

Each of these privileges refers directly to a particular historical act of YHWH (e.g. the giving of the Law, the covenants, and the promises), an activity the Israelites perform (e.g. the worship), or particular people or things (e.g. the glory of God, the patriarchs, and the lineage of the Messiah). In most cases there is a word to word, or at least a concept to concept (e.g. Paul's νομοθεσία and νόμος) correspondence between Paul's privilege and the event/action/or person to which it refers. By contrast, υἱοθεσία does not directly refer to any obvious event in Israel's history, nor does it pick out a concrete object or activity. This ostensibly suggests that in Romans 9:4 Paul means the term as a qualitative description of Israel's ongoing relationship with YHWH rather than a quantifiable bestowing of the privilege at a particular moment in Israel's history. However, this claim must be considered in more detail, and I will do so below in the discussion surrounding the metaphor's tenor, which is closely related to the referent of the metaphor. The lack of a direct referent for υἱοθεσία leads to the tentative conclusion that, unlike the other privileges in Romans 9:4, υἱοθεσία is a qualitative and metaphorical description of YHWH's ongoing covenant relationship with Israel. Thus the metaphorical utterance we are dealing with is οἵτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται, ὧν ἡ υἱοθεσία, in which Paul is speaking of Israel's covenant relationship with YHWH in terms which are seen to be suggestive of υἱοθεσία. This conclusion will become firmer as we proceed through the analysis of the metaphor's tenor and vehicle below, which will discuss the referent of the metaphor in Romans 9:4 with more detail and clarity.

2.2 Tenor and Vehicle

In this identified metaphor (οἵτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται, ὧν ἡ υἱοθεσία), the vehicle is ostensibly υἱοθεσία.[26] Paul is speaking about the tenor in terms which are

[25] On the significance of Christ in Romans 9:5 in particular see Hans-Christian Kammler, "Die Prädikation Jesu Christi als 'Gott' und die paulinische Christologie: Erwägungen zur Exegese von Röm 9,5b," *ZNW* 94.3-4 (2003): 164-80.

[26] Recall again from the first chapter that I will speak of a metaphor as having both a "tenor," which is "the subject upon which it is hoped light will be shed," and a vehicle, which is "the subject to which allusion is made in order to shed that light" (Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 27). Recall also that the tenor of the metaphor need not be explicitly mentioned in the text, but rather is evoked and implied by the vehicle (for a more complete explanation see section 2.3.1 of chapter 2). In Soskice's definition, the

seen to be suggestive of υἱοθεσία, which means that Paul is speaking about *something* (i.e. the tenor) using the framework of υἱοθεσία (i.e. the vehicle). This seems relatively straightforward, except that, as I described earlier, υἱοθεσία might have evoked more than one model simultaneously (e.g. Roman adoption *and* the Jewish sonship tradition). So it is possible then, that various readers could have construed the vehicle as a framework of Roman adoption, as the Jewish sonship tradition, or more likely, both ideas together as mutually interpreting one another. Thus the vehicle here is not merely υἱοθεσία, as a single word, but the whole set of associations evoked by the word *and* its literary and historical-cultural background.[27] Given that the metaphor occurs within the context of a list of Israel's privileges, it is particularly likely here that both the Jewish sonship tradition and the Roman understanding of adoption hang together in a delicate balance to form the metaphor's vehicle.

The tenor of the metaphor has several potential candidates to consider: (1) YHWH's ratification of the covenant and "adoption" of Israel at Mt. Sinai, (2) the "adoption" of the Davidide that is referred to in 2 Samuel 7:14 and Psalm 2:7,[28] or (3) Israel's ongoing covenant relationship with YHWH. Because metaphors extend an invitation to the audience to participate in the construction of their meaning, it is impossible to entirely rule out any one option for consideration, but I will argue that the context in Romans 9:4 strongly favors the third option over the first two (or others).

The first option must be considered because of its popularity among scholars who seek to link Israel's adoption with a particular historical occurrence, which most claim is the ratification of the covenant at Sinai where υἱοθεσία is connected to the giving of the law (Exod 19:16-20; 20:1-21). First, it is possible for metaphorical utterances to pick out historical events. For example, "the fall of the iron curtain" is a metaphorical description that picks out the end of the Cold War. So then, scholars who argue this position claim that Paul's privilege of υἱοθεσία refers to a particular event in Israel's history. Abasciano expresses this view well when he claims that

---

first half pertains to the tenor (*speaking of one thing)* and the second refers to the vehicle (*in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another*) (Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15).

[27] The possible backgrounds for the underlying model(s) of υἱοθεσία were discussed in detail in chapter 4.

[28] Scott sees these two Old Testament references as the "*unified and specific Old Testament/Jewish background of 'adoption as sons' (υἱοθεσία) in the Corpus Paulinum*" (*Adoption as Sons*, 269 [emph. orig.]).

Israel's "adoption was uniquely established through the ratification of the covenant on Sinai."[29] Schreiner argues that υἱοθεσία is connected to νομοθεσία, stating that "both…hark back to the exodus events when Israel was redeemed as God's son…and the covenant was ratified through the giving of the law."[30] Similarly, Dunn describes Paul's use of υἱοθεσία as "evoking the folk memory of that initial great act of redemption whereby God took the children of Israel as his own,"[31] and Schlier argues, "Dabei ist υἱοθεσία die Sohnschaft, die durch Adoption zustande kommt,"[32] both also citing Exodus 4:22.

However, connecting Israel's adoption to the exodus events is unsatisfying for several reasons. First, there is no Old Testament occurrence where Israel *becomes* the son of YHWH, rather Israel's designation as *son* is assumed and used as the basis for YHWH's actions toward Israel or on Israel's behalf, or for Israel's need to behave in a particular way (e.g. Exod 4:22; Deut 8:5; 14:1-2; Mal 1:6). The text in Exodus cited by scholars who hold this position does not seem to imply that YHWH's command to Moses *makes* Israel the son of YHWH at this moment, but rather the command to Pharaoh is based on the assumption that Israel *is* the son of YHWH already. This is not an installation of Israel to sonship, but rather an affirmation of Israel's current status as the son of YHWH. Moreover, though Abasciano and Schreiner point to Exodus 4:22 as the "adoption," they also want to connect Israel's adoption with the giving of the law, which happens much later in Exodus, after Israel—YHWH's son—has been delivered from Egypt. Furthermore, when the law is given at Sinai there is no mention of Israel's sonship (see esp. Exod 19-24; 32-34 where one might have expected sonship to be ratified) so it seems tendentious to conclude that Paul is connecting the status of sonship with the giving of the law based solely on its use much earlier in Exodus 4:22.

I would suggest that if there were such a moment to pick out as the tenor of the metaphor, for Paul it would seem more natural for it to rest with YHWH's establishment of the covenant with Abraham (Gen 12:1-2; 17:1-14), the foundation of Israel as the recipients of God's promises. Käsemann alludes to this moment as the

---

[29] Abasciano, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 124.
[30] Schreiner, *Romans*, 483; see also *TDNT*, 8:359-60.
[31] Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 2, 533; see also Barrett, *Romans*, 177; John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965), vol. 2, 5.
[32] Schlier, *Römerbrief*, 286.

ratification of Israel's adoption when he states, "The relationship of the Christian world *to Abraham* is now extended to all Israel."[33] Moreover, Paul himself seems quite concerned with tracing the lineage of true Israel to Abraham and the promise rather than to Moses and the Law (Rom 4:1-25; Gal 3:6-29). The Pauline references to Abraham are littered with the same vocabulary of "sons," (Gal 3:26) "seed," (Romans 4:13, 16, 18; Gal 3:16, 19, 29) "heir," (Romans 4:14; Gal 3:29) "inheritance," (Romans 4:13; Gal 3:18) and "promise" (Gal 3:14, 17-19, 21-22, 29) that we find in the Pauline adoption passages, making it unlikely that Paul now abruptly would connect Israel's sonship to Moses and the giving of the Law rather than to Abraham and the giving of the promise.[34] However, the text in Genesis never refers to Abraham or his descendants as sons of YHWH. Instead, the first time a sonship metaphor occurs refers to Israel as a collective, which is in God's command to Moses, "Then you shall say to Pharaoh…Israel is my firstborn son" in Exodus 4:22-23.[35] This text speaks of Israel's sonship as an established relationship, indeed an established relationship directly parallel to Pharaoh's relationship with his firstborn son.

Regarding the second option, while it is possible that the audience would have reduced the reference to Israel's collective adoption to the expectation of individual sonship of the messianic Davidic king, there is little within the context to nudge the audience members in that direction. Certainly it is possible, as Scott argues, that the Davidic king was so central a figure in Israel's history that references to Israel's collective sonship in the developing tradition were always evocative of the individual sonship of the messianic Davidide.[36] In defense of this point, Scott asserts that

> whereas 2 Sam. 7 subsumed the Davidic promise under the covenant with Israel, the subsequent Jewish tradition based on 2 Sam. 7:14 oriented the renewal of the covenant relationship, including Israel's divine sonship (cf. Hos. 2:1), to the messianically-interpreted Davidic promise.…Hence the national expectation of divine adoption, converging as it does with the messianic expectation, leads to an appropriation of 2 Sam. 7:14a to the eschatological people of God as a

---

[33] Käsemann, *Romans*, 258 (emph. mine); see also Schlatter who traces Israel's privileges back to Abraham rather than to Moses and the giving of the law (*Römer*, 171).

[34] This is particularly true in Galatians 3:26-29, where Paul connects the "sons of God through faith in Christ" (υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) with the "seed of Abraham" (εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ, ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα ἐστέ).

[35] וְאָמַרְתָּ אֶל־פַּרְעֹה כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה בְּנִי בְכֹרִי יִשְׂרָאֵל / σὺ δὲ ἐρεῖς τῷ Φαραω Τάδε λέγει κύριος Υἱὸς πρωτότοκός μου Ισραηλ (Exod 4:22).

[36] See Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 96-117.

> whole, a sort of national identification with the sonship of the *Heilbringer*.[37]

However, in his exegesis of Romans 9:4 Scott fails to address the fact that in Romans 9:4-5 Paul mentions both the adoption of Israel *and* the ethnic descent of the messiah (Scott's Davidide). If one is wrapped up in the other, as Scott claims, then why is it necessary for Paul to mention both the adoption of Israel and the lineage of the Davidide? It seems that for Paul, the adoption of Israel is a separate privilege from the ethnic descent of the messiah rather than it "converging…with the messianic expectation."[38] Furthermore, Scott fails to address the trajectory of Paul's list of privileges, which culminates in privileging Israel collectively, as an ethnic group, as the kinsmen and the source of the *individual* messiah. This trajectory leads Kammler to argue, "Bezieht man nämlich die Eulogie auf Christus, dann ergibt sich innerhalb der Aufzählung der Prärogativen Israels nicht nur eine klare Klimax, sondern auch ein wirkungsvoller Abschluß."[39] Furthermore, Paul's list of privileges follows the same trajectory as the Old Testament, in which the Davidide is named the firstborn son of YHWH because he is the preeminent representative of Israel's collective sonship mentioned much earlier in Exodus 4:22.[40] Likewise, Paul's list of privileges in Romans 9:4-5 moves from the collective sonship of Israel to the individual Messiah, the preeminent representative of the Israelites, which makes it unlikely that υἱοθεσία, near the beginning of the list, refers to the Davidide's sonship rather than the collective sonship of Israel.

Though it is not possible to completely rule out the first two possibilities for all of Paul's audience members, the most likely candidate for the tenor of the metaphor is Israel's covenant relationship with YHWH.[41] Above I argued that it is unlikely that Paul's designation here picks out any historical act where YHWH designates Israel as his son, and that the descriptions "firstborn" or "son" are not exhaustive as a portrayal of Israel's covenant relationship with YHWH. However,

---

[37] Ibid., 117.
[38] Ibid.
[39] Kammler, "Die Prädikation," 169.
[40] Indeed this could be said of Scott's argument as a whole, which consistently views the individual Davidide as the source for the collective understanding of sonship. It seems to me that this is precisely backward from the trajectory of collective to individual that we find in the Old Testament texts.
[41] So Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 545; Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 81; Klaus Haacker, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (THKNT 6, Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2006), 208; Johannes Munck, *Christ and Israel: An Interpretation of Romans 9-11* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), 27-34.

given the close affinity of the concept "adoption" and the concept of Israel's "sonship" found in the sonship tradition, it is likely that Paul's use of υἱοθεσία here *both evokes and interprets* the Old Testament description of Israel as the son, or the firstborn son, of YHWH, which most often occurs in connection with YHWH's covenant relationship with Israel (e.g. Exod 4:22; Deut 8:5; 14:1; Mal 3:16-17; Isa 1:2; 63:8; Jer 31:9; Hos 2:1 (1:10).[42]

Furthermore, since Paul's inclusion of υἱοθεσία in the list of privileges of Israel in Romans 9:4 occurs after its use in Romans 8 as a metaphorical description of the believers' relationship to the Father, Son, and Spirit, it is likely that the audience would see Israel's adoption as analogous, at least in some ways, to the adoption of believers in the previous passage.[43] Perhaps then, in the same way that the Spirit of adoption testifies to the believers' relationship with Christ in the new covenant, υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4 resonates as an apt description of God's ongoing covenant relationship with Israel. Although some scholars argue that Paul is emphasizing the differences between Israel's "preparatory" adoption and the "full adoption" of believers in Romans 8,[44] it is just as likely that Paul uses υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4 to highlight the similarities of God's past actions toward Israel and God's present actions towards believers in Christ. Moreover, though it is highly unlikely that Paul's audience heard the same set of implications with each use of Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor, because Paul's metaphor in 9:4 evokes two models (Roman adoption and Israelite sonship), it is likely that these models produce an expanded set of implications rather than implying a more restricted form of adoption than what Paul intends for believers in Romans 8. Rather, it seems more reasonable to conclude that the metaphor in Romans 9:4 built upon the previous set of implications produced by the metaphors in Romans 8 rather than subtracted from it. However, this is not to say that the metaphor in Romans 9:4 is entirely parallel to the metaphors in Romans 8:15-23, but rather to point out that the rapid succession of the metaphors highlights the commonality between the believers and Israel rather than their differences. In light of this, the tenor of the metaphor should be understood as Israel's covenant relationship

[42] These texts will be discussed in more detail below in section 3.1.
[43] Käsemann remarks, "The plerophory in the list which follows stresses by its careful structuring the fulness of the experienced blessing from complementary and overlapping points of view" (*Romans*, 258).
[44] E.g. Murray, *Romans*, vol. 2, 3-4; Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 2, 461; Moo, *Romans*, 562.

with YHWH, which in some way parallels God's covenant relationship with the believers in Romans 8.

2.3 The Frame of Romans 9:4

Above I have alluded to the idea that the shift in focus from believers in Romans 8 to ethnic Israel in Romans 9 results in a different set of implications for the metaphorical utterance containing υἱοθεσία. In the second chapter of the thesis I described differences in context with the term "frame," suggesting that a change in a metaphor's "frame" would result in a change in the meaning of the metaphor.[45] Here, then, it is worth pointing out that there has been a drastic shift in the frame of the υἱοθεσία metaphor between Romans 8 and Romans 9. In Romans 8 the metaphorical utterance occurred as part of Paul's extended discourse on the connection between the Spirit and the eschatological identity of the believers. In contrast, the metaphor in Romans 9:4 exists as part of a new section of the letter where Paul exposits on the fate of ethnic Israel. The drastic change in the focus of chapters 9-11 constitutes a drastic shift in the frame of the υἱοθεσία metaphor, this shift in frame changes the meaning of the metaphor in Romans 9:4. Furthermore, the shift in frame also might add to, or alter slightly, the audience's perception of υἱοθεσία in Romans 8 as the audience considers the two metaphors together.[46]

Several previous studies on the υἱοθεσία metaphors have sought to distill the metaphors into a single meaning by reading an Old Testament background into its use in Romans 8 based on Paul's list of privileges in Romans 9:4.[47] This is an unnecessary false dichotomy because it is perfectly reasonable to expect that the different frames in Romans 8 and 9 will produce two slightly different meanings for these metaphors. While the frame in Romans 8 perhaps does not nudge the audience to consider the sonship tradition of the Old Testament, but rather remains squarely focused on the present situation and eschatological destiny of members of the community of faith, this is not the case in Romans 9. As we saw above, the content of Romans 9 is focused on the fate of ethnic Israel and the promises of God. Furthermore, within the immediate context of Romans 9:1-5 Paul is reflecting

---

[45] For a full explanation see section 2.2.1 of chapter 2.
[46] This will be discussed in greater detail in the section on metaphor and perception (see section 4.1 below).
[47] E.g. Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 79-139; Garner, "Adoption in Christ," 42-55.

retrospectively on the fate of his kinsfolk in light of the Christ-event. This represents a considerable change in Paul's tone from expectant eschatological hope in Romans 8 to anguish in Romans 9. Moreover, Paul is reflecting on the fate of Israel *as an Israelite*,[48] intensifying the emotional content of the passage as he draws the audience into the story of God's people from past to present in his introductory statement in Romans 9:1-5. The frame in Romans 9 both looks *back over the history of Israel* and to *its future destiny as the people of YHWH*. Therefore, while there is little to nudge the believers to consider their υἱοθεσία in light of the sonship tradition of Israel in Romans 8, the same cannot be said here for Romans 9.

The drastic change in the metaphor's frame draws the sonship tradition of the Old Testament and the intertestamental literature clearly into view in Romans 9:4. While there may have been some members of Paul's audience who would have heard the sonship tradition in each of the previous υἱοθεσία metaphors, here it is likely that the majority of Paul's audience would have understood υἱοθεσία as evocative of Israel's covenant relationship with YHWH established long before the coming of Christ, and it is likely many would have identified υἱοθεσία with other texts in the Jewish sonship tradition in particular. However, because a metaphor is not a neutral conduit of information, and because Paul uses υἱοθεσία rather than υἱός/υἱοί or πρωτότοκος we must recognize that although Paul evokes the sonship tradition in Romans 9:4, he also reinterprets it by using a different metaphorical designation as a predication of Israel's historical covenant relationship.[49] I will examine Paul's interpretation of the sonship tradition and the intertextual relationships of Romans 9:4 in due course, but here it is enough to conclude that although the Jewish sonship tradition may not have been as important in Romans 8 or Galatians 4, Paul's change in frame in Romans 9 results in a greater awareness of possible intertextual relationships with Jewish sources for his audience members.

2.4 The Emphasis and Resonance of Υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4

At this point some may argue that υἱοθεσία is but one term among many in a list Paul gives of Israel's historic privileges, and that this rather mundane and

[48] For a good explanation of the honor of the designation Ισραηλίτης in Romans 9:4 see Moo, *The Romans*, 560-61 (esp. 561 n. 30); Haacker, *Römer*, 208.
[49] The intertextual issue raised by the intersection of models will be discussed more thoroughly in section 3 below.

unaccented occurrence should not be given a disproportionate amount of attention.[50] The reader must ask here, then, how emphatic and resonant is this occurrence of υἱοθεσία, and what is its potential for shaping or reshaping the perception, emotion, and identity of the community?[51] Recall that a metaphor is emphatic to the degree that its vehicle cannot be substituted for another vehicle and produce the same meaning.[52] Here then, the level of emphasis is determined by whether Paul could have used a different word than υἱοθεσία to produce the same set of implications for the metaphor. Furthermore, alongside Black's understanding of emphasis we should also consider whether in this context υἱοθεσία is "emphasized" in a more traditional understanding of "emphasis"—that is, whether the term would have stood out to the audience enough for them to reflect on its uniqueness.

As I have already noted, υἱοθεσία is never used to describe the collective sonship of Israel anywhere in the LXX or in the intertestamental literature, which in itself makes Paul's use of it here rather striking. Furthermore, the other possible substitutes for υἱοθεσία, such as υἱός/υἱοί, πρωτότοκος, and μονογενής rely on models which differ in significant ways from υἱοθεσία.[53] On the other hand, as noted above, it may be that Paul only uses υἱοθεσία for stylistic purposes, constrained as he is by his parallelism of feminine endings. However, even if it is the case that Paul's word choice is dictated by the parallelism he wishes to create, the parallelism itself draws attention to each term in the list, which potentially would cause the audience to carefully consider each of the terms.

Furthermore, Paul begins his new section in Romans 9:1 with the rather striking *asyndeton* Ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐ ψεύδομαι…ὅτι λύπη μοί ἐστιν μεγάλη καὶ ἀδιάλειπτος ὀδύνη τῇ καρδίᾳ μου, which not only is a drastic change in tone from the closing verses of chapter 8 (πέπεισμαι γὰρ ὅτι…δυνήσεται ἡμᾶς

---

[50] Indeed many commentaries only devote a sentence or two to υἱοθεσία, and most imply that its reference is self-evident (e.g. Peter Stuhlmacher, *Paul's Letter to the Romans*, trans. Scott Hafemann [Louisville: WJK, 1994], 145; Schlier, *Römerbrief*, 286; Morris, *Romans*, 348; Frederic Godet, *Commentary on Romans* [Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1977], 341). Indeed, even Scott's monograph devoted to the Pauline use of υἱοθεσία only contains a one paragraph excurses on its meaning in Romans 9:4 (*Adoption as Sons*, 148-49).

[51] The specific ways in which Romans 9:4 might potentially affect the perception, emotion, and identity of Paul's audience will be explored in much greater detail in section 4 below. Here we must concern ourselves with the question of whether it is even advisable to understand this metaphor as having the potential to influence the audience in this way at all.

[52] See section 2.2.2 of chapter 2 for a fuller treatment of emphasis and resonance; see also Black, "Metaphor," 26.

[53] See also the explanation of model and metaphor in section 2.3.2 of chapter 2.

χωρίσαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν), but also lacks a conjunction.[54] Paul's lack of transition from Romans 8 to Romans 9 and his choice of words in Romans 9:1 suggests that he wished for this passage to be read "with striking emphasis and solemnity."[55] This solemn tone and slow cadence of the opening verses of Romans 9 suggests that although υἱοθεσία occurs as a single term among a list, it carries at least a moderate degree of emphasis, meaning that the term itself is not replaceable with another term, and that the addressees would have had time to consider the term within its context in Romans 9:4.[56]

Recall from the first chapter that a metaphor's resonance is determined by the degree of implicative elaboration it supports.[57] Here, then, we must question whether the audience is encouraged to linger over υἱοθεσία and contemplate its implications to determine the resonance of the metaphor. While it may be tempting in a study on υἱοθεσία to conclude that each of its occurrences is both emphatic and resonant, it is somewhat difficult to argue that this is the case in Romans 9:4. Whereas Paul elaborates on each of the occurrences of υἱοθεσία in Romans 8 in greater detail, and indeed the trajectory of the passage points to υἱοθεσία as the pinnacle of redemption in Romans 8:23, the metaphor in Romans 9:4 is used as part of Paul's introductory material to prove that God has not reneged on his promises to Israel. The vindication of God and the trustworthiness of his promises are the true themes of Romans 9-11, and the list of privileges in Romans 9:4 is but a dramatic introduction to Paul's exposition of this theme. The nature of an introduction does not necessarily lend itself to inviting the audience to mull over its content, as its purpose is to prepare the way for a fuller explanation of its themes in what follows. Thus υἱοθεσία here is not resonant in and of itself, but rather it plays a supporting role to the vindication of God's historical actions and plan for Israel.

---

[54] Regarding the asyndeton Haacker argues, "Sie rechtfertig keine literarkritische Herauslösung der folgenden drei Kapitel aus dem Briefganzen, läßt aber nach der Logik des Übergangs zu dem neuen Thema fragen" (*Römer*, 203-204).

[55] Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 2, 451. See also Godet, who sees the asyndeton as "evidence of a lively emotion which, breaks, so to speak, the logical bond" but also "attests at the same time with all the more energy the profound relation of feeling which unites this piece [Romans 9] to the preceding" (*Commentary on Romans*, 338).

[56] Indeed, each term in the list can be seen as emphatic, although it is unusual to make such a claim regarding a list. However, although the other terms in the list are not metaphorical, neither are they easily replaceable with other words.

[57] See section 2.2.2 of chapter 2 for a more detailed explanation; see also Black, "More About Metaphor," 26.

Perhaps it is best to think of Romans 9:1-5, and the υἱοθεσία metaphor it contains, as an overture to the rest of Romans 9-11. As an overture, it introduces in brief the themes that are used in the rest of the chapters to tell the story of God and his covenant people, Israel. An overture's themes may be emphatic and accented, but they are not resonant in our understanding of the word. A listener at an opera does not dwell on the themes of the overture after the first act has begun. However, the themes of the overture are carried through the arias and choruses of the opera, tying together the plot and giving depth to the characters. By this analogy, we should not expect that υἱοθεσία has a high degree of resonance here, but rather that as part of the overture, Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor introduces the themes of Romans 9-11, and as the plot develops υἱοθεσία colors God's actions for the reader and sheds light on his character as Paul's narrative unfolds. We then might think of the resonance of υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4 subtly coloring Paul's assertion that "the children of the promise are counted as seed" (Rom 9:8),[58] his quotation from Hosea in Romans 9:25-26,[59] and his metaphor of the wild and natural branches of the olive tree (Rom 11:17-24). These resonances will be examined in more detail in the next section as they are an integral component to the intertextual relationships created by the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4. Though υἱοθεσία is not particularly resonant in and of itself as part of a list in the introduction, there is, perhaps, a subliminal undercurrent of υἱοθεσία that extends beyond the introduction of the chapters and surfaces at various times as a countermelody to the main theme of God's faithfulness in Romans 9-11.[60]

3. Metaphor and Intertextuality in Romans 9:4

Although the previous exegetical chapters have not included a prolonged discussion on the intertextual relationships created by the metaphor, here such a discussion is necessary because of Paul's overt evocation of Israel's history in Romans 9:4-5, and because υἱοθεσία does not occur in the LXX or in other Jewish literature. Moreover, although one might typically have expected a detailed survey of texts in the Israelite sonship tradition to be included in the introductory material, the

---

[58] τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας λογίζεται εἰς σπέρμα.

[59] "And in the very place it was said to them 'You are not my people,' there they will be called sons of the living God" (καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς· οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος).

[60] For a fuller treatment of the structure and place of Rom. 9:1-5 in Rom. 9-11 see Abasciano, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 36-41.

complexity of intertextual relationships created between the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4 and other Jewish texts are most visible and striking when they are examined side by side. In previous chapters I argued that intertextual relationships are both synchronic and diachronic, influenced both by previous texts and current cultural and lexical factors.[61] Though the possibility exists that there were subtle intertextual relationships present in Galatians 4 and Romans 8, in Romans 9 the intertextual relationships evoked and created by the υἱοθεσία metaphor are much more overt. By ascribing υἱοθεσία to the Israelites and grouping it with other well-known and easily recognizable privileges of ethnic Israel, Paul invites his readers to contemplate υἱοθεσία as an historic privilege, which likely also entails his audience contemplating an intertextual relationship.[62] However, while some of the other privileges in Paul's list arguably have more straightforward intertextual relationships, such as νομοθεσία recalling Mt. Sinai, or λατρεία recalling the temple cult, I would suggest that the intertextual interplay created by the intersection of υἱοθεσία with texts in Israel's sonship tradition is more complex.

It is also necessary to recognize at the outset that Paul's reinterpretation of themes or elements in other sonship metaphors is not overt. Rather, Paul's use of υἱοθεσία (rather than another term for sonship in Romans 9:4) is a subtle example of metalepsis. Hays remarks, "When a literary echo links the text in which it occurs to an earlier text, the figurative effect of the echo can lie in the unstated or suppressed (transumed) points of resonance between the two texts."[63] Though Hays uses "echo" to describe the recollection of earlier texts, the vocabulary, or lexemes, of his echoes are most often also found in the original setting of the text.[64] The metalepsis in Romans 9:4 is a subtle evocation of the "Israelite sonship" tradition based on the interplay between "son/sons," (also "firstborn" and "only child") and "adoption,"

---

[61] For a full explanation see section 3.1.3 of chapter 2 and section 2 of chapter 4.
[62] The hypothetical situation where no intertextual relationship would be evoked would occur if a reader who had no knowledge of the Israelites or their Scriptures and traditions encountered Paul's metaphor in Romans 9:4. This, of course, is highly unlikely.
[63] Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 20.
[64] E.g. Hays identifies an echo in Phil 1.19 which reads τοῦτό μοι ἀποβήσεται εἰς σωτηρίαν, which, as Hays remarks, "is a verbatim citation of words lifted from Job 13:16" (ibid., 21). Hays also points to Rom 1:16-17 as an echo of Isa 51:4-5 and Isa 52:10, both of which reference righteousness, gentiles, and salvation (ibid., 36-37). In each instance the metalepsis Hays identifies is contingent upon a shared vocabulary, and while there is certainly overlap in the concept Paul evokes with his υἱοθεσία metaphor, the metaphor relies on vocabulary unique to Paul. I would suggest that the change in vocabulary from other "Israelite sonship" metaphors is significant enough to merit a different label from Hays's "echo."

which is created entirely by Paul's unique vocabulary in his metaphor. Rather than overtly reinterpreting the "Israelite sonship" tradition, Paul's metaphor "places the reader within a field of whispered or unstated correspondences."[65] Since the literary terminology of "echo" usually suggests that Paul is evoking an idea that is present in earlier texts, it may be more helpful to view Paul's use of υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4 instead as a "reflection." As a "reflection," υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4 functions like Paul's carefully chosen mirror that shows precisely those elements of the sonship tradition that he wishes to highlight.[66]

Since Paul employs a unique vocabulary term—υἱοθεσία—for his version of Israel's designation as "son," the analysis of the metaphor must consider how this term functions as a "reflection" of the sonship tradition. As a reflection, Paul's use of "adoption" changes and alters the readers' perception of Israel's sonship in other texts where other terms are used. I will argue below that in the "points of resonance" created in the intertextual space between Paul's metaphor in Romans 9:4 and other iterations of the sonship tradition, Paul engages and reinterprets several of the themes present in other examples of "Israelite sonship" metaphors.

As I will show in the analysis below, any investigation into the intertextual relationship between Romans 9:4 and texts in Israel's sonship tradition needs to take seriously both Paul's role as an interpreter within that tradition and the audience as recipients of Paul's unique interpretation. Here then, the goal of this intertextual analysis will not be to trace the origin or development of the sonship tradition, but rather I will apply Michael Peppard's insightful question "What meaningful connections would listeners likely have made, connections both intended and unintended by speakers?"[67] Since υἱοθεσία is unique among other examples of sonship metaphors in the Old Testament and intertestamental literature, this intertextual analysis will consider the possibility that Paul has chosen to use υἱοθεσία in response to other sonship metaphors that would not have fitted with his theological understanding of God's relationship with Israel. To examine this possibility I will first look at some examples of sonship metaphors from other sources in the Old Testament

---

[65] Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 20.
[66] Though it may seem that mirrors are neutral and objective reflectors, consider how much impact the size and shape of the mirror, the color of the glass, the lighting, etc. have on constraining the reflection that one is able to see in the mirror.
[67] Peppard, *The Son of God*, 27.

and intertestamental literature, as these other occurrences of the sonship metaphor provide a window into some possible diachronic relationships that underlie the Pauline metaphor. The analysis of these texts will focus in particular on elements of these metaphors that may have been at odds with the Pauline image. I will then examine Paul's unique "reflection" of that tradition and the peculiar emphasis of υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4 against the backdrop of other occurrences of Israelite sonship metaphors.

Moreover, it must be recognized at the outset that "the sonship tradition" itself is not a monolithic entity. Indeed, there are many types of sonship metaphors found in Jewish literature that are not as closely linked as the ones we will consider with Paul's use of υἱοθεσία in the list of privileges for the Israelites in Romans 9:4.[68] A variety of sonship metaphors appear in Jewish texts where the vehicle "son (or sons) of God" is used to describe angels or heavenly beings (e.g. Gen 6:2; Job 1:6; 38:7; Ps 29:1; Wis 5:5; *1 En.* 69.4-5; 71.1; 106.5; *T. Levi* 4.2-4; *T. Ab.* 12.5; *Pr. Jos.* 6-8; *Hist. Rech.* 5.4; Philo, *QG* 1.91),[69] royalty (e.g. 2 Sam 7:14; 1 Chr 22:10; Ps 2:7; *Jos. Asen.* 21:3;),[70] messianic figures (e.g. *Apoc. Ab.* 2:1),[71] and wise or righteous people (e.g. Prov 3:11-

[68] "Son of God" also is clearly an important expression in Roman sources, though again these intertextual connections seem further afield than those in Jewish sources. For an excellent analysis of "son of god" as a Roman title see Peppard, *The Son of God*, 31-49.

[69] The metaphors describing the sonship of angelic beings differ somewhat in their construction. In Gen 6:2; Job 1:6; 38:7, and Ps 29:1 they are described as "sons of God" (most often: בְּנֵי־הָאֱלֹהִים/υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ), but it is also worth noting that *1 Enoch* uses the designation "sons of heaven" to refer to angelic beings (*1 Enoch* 6:2; 13:8; 14:3). For an analysis of the angelic beings in *1 Enoch* see George Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1* (Hermeneia, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 208-210; *idem,* "Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6-11," *JBL* 96.3 (1977): 383-405; Paul Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6-11," *JBL* 96.2 (1977): 195-233.

[70] See Adela Yarbro Collins, and John J. Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 1-47; Larry Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 101-108; Tryggve N. D. Mettinger, *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings* (ConBOT 8, Lund: Gleerup, 1976); G. Cooke, "The Israelite King as Son of God," *ZAW* 35 (1964): 22-47; Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 96-120.

[71] See Collins and Collins, *King and Messiah*; Magnus Zetterholm, "Pre-Christian Jewish Messianism: An Overview," in *The Messiah in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), xxi-xxvii; Stanley Porter, ed., *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007); Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*; John J. Collins, "The *Son of God* Text from Qumran," in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*, ed. Martinus C. De Boer (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 65-82; James D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: An Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*, 2nd ed. (London: SCM, 1989). I would also note the importance of the metaphorical designation "son of man" and the correlated research on "son of man" for texts in this category. For an overview of recent scholarship see Larry Hurtado, and Paul Owen, eds., *"Who is This Son of Man?": The Latest Scholarship on a Puzzling Expression of the Historical Jesus* (London: T & T Clark, 2011); Delbert Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation* (SNTSMS 107, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999). See also Collins, and Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God*, 75-100; Joseph Fitzmyer, *The One Who Is*

12; Sir 4:10; Wis 2:12, 18; *Jos. Asen.* 6.3; 13.10; 16.8; Philo, *Conf.* 145-47; *Spec* 1.318),[72] in addition to the texts where "son/sons of God' is predicated of Israel and the Israelites. The diverse emphases of the sources containing sonship metaphors, and the diversity of the metaphors themselves, indicates that the designation "son of God" could and did connote a variety of things within Jewish literature. However, it is far beyond the scope of this study to address every occurrence of "son/sons of God" within Old Testament and intertestamental sources, especially if we were to take the multivalent nature of metaphor into account and address each of the sources and metaphors and the nuance of their particular implication complex. Here we must recognize that in undertaking an intertextual reading, one is necessarily confronted with the problem of which intertextual relationships to consider.[73] If lacking a clear rationale for the choice of some texts over others, the methodology can devolve quickly into arbitrariness, or the exegete can be overwhelmed by Jacob Neusner's hyperbolic imperative that intertextuality requires her to "read everything in light of everything, everywhere, all at once."[74] In light of this concern, the texts below were chosen because they contain particularly well-developed metaphors that make explicit reference to what I will hereafter refer to as "Israelite sonship." I also must state at the outset of this analysis that it is not my intention here to use sonship metaphors to make a statement about the nature or development of Judaism(s)[75] in general, as if the sonship metaphor represented a sort of microcosm of a widespread understanding of Jewish identity. My purpose in examining these texts is to bring them into conversation with the Pauline metaphor in Romans 9:4 to see how Paul's use of

---

To Come (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007); Hurtado; *Lord Jesus Christ*, 290-306; Adela Yarbro Collins, "The Origin of the Designation of Jesus as 'Son of Man,'" *HTR* 80 (1987): 391-408; Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 65-97; Maurice Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel* 7 (London: SPCK, 1979).

[72] See Hengel, *The Son of God*, 41-51; Simon S. Joseph, "Seek His Kingdom": Q 12, 22b-31, God's Providence, and Adamic Wisdom," *Bib* 92.3 (2011): 392-410; Paul Overland, "Did the Sage Draw from the Shema? A Study of Proverbs 3:1-12," *CBQ* 62 (2000): 424-40; Arndt Meinhold, "Gott und Mensch in Proverbien III," *VT* 37.4 (1987): 468-77.

[73] Stefan Alkier elucidates this problem well in his essay, "Intertextuality and the Semiotics of Biblical Texts," in *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, eds. Stefan Alkier, Richard B. Hays, and Leroy A. Huizenga (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009), 3.

[74] Neusner, *Canon and Connection*, xiii.

[75] For differing perspectives on Judaism and Jewish sects see E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (NTL, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1977), 425-28; Jacob Neusner, *From Politics to Piety: The Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism*, 2nd ed. (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2003).

υἱοθεσία might be responding to or interpreting emphases found in some manifestations of "Israelite sonship" metaphors.

However, it is possible, as Byrne argues, that each of the texts in the diverse categories (angelic beings, royal figures, wise/righteous people, and messianic figures) contains a possible intertextual point of contact for υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4.[76] To address Byrne's contention let me put forward an analogy: the intertextual relationships Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor evokes in Romans 9:4 are like the concentric ripples caused by a water droplet upsetting the surface of a pond. By this analogy, texts where "son(s) of God" is used as a designation for the Israelites represent the highest waves nearest the center of the circle, and texts where the metaphor is used of angelic figures, the wise/righteous person, royalty, or messianic figures are the smaller, outer waves, which are still perceptible as the intertextual ripples dissipate. In this way, the text in Romans 9:4 itself provides the guidelines for determining the most pertinent intertextual relationships; clearly the closest points of contact are with other texts where Israel, or the Israelites are designated son/sons.[77] Therefore, the most pertinent texts for intertextual analysis are those that predicate sonship to Israel or Israelites because they are closest in proximity to Paul's metaphor.

Narrowing the focus to those texts where "son of God" is used as a designation for Israel or Israelites permits better position to bring the distinct emphasis of Paul's metaphor into sharp relief; the collision of texts is the strongest and most observable closest to the center of the intertextual circle. Thus, because sonship is a privilege of the *Israelites* in Romans 9:4, the most suitable place to begin the analysis on the possible textual connections is texts where "Israel" or the "Israelites" are spoken of in terms of sonship. Therefore, while it is possible the intertextual echoes reverberate to farther removed texts where "son" denotes a wise or royal figure, or an angelic being (etc.), it is not unreasonable to proceed with the assumption that *the closest intertextual point of contact is to texts where a term denoting sonship is predicated of Israel or Israelites.* Since it is beyond the scope of this project to examine all types of sonship metaphors, and since the other types bear

---

[76] Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 216-21. Byrne concludes, "Paul's understanding and employment of the 'sonship of God' idea is, then, intimately involved in his radical rethinking of Jewish theology… [which] all takes place within the conceptual framework of Judaism: Paul works within the Jewish categories, employs Jewish terminology, has recourse to the Jewish basis of proof—Scripture" (ibid., 220).

[77] For more on the text constraining intertextual relationships see Holthuis, *Intertextualität*, 180.

a more distant textual relationship to Romans 9:4, I will limit my analysis below to the Jewish texts that contain references to *Israel's sonship* rather than considering the vehicle "sonship" in more general terms.

One further complication to the task of analyzing intertextual connections is the fact that the texts which will be examined below do not use "sonship" with an identical emphasis or context. Moreover, the occurrences I will examine possess intertextual relationships with one another, and any one of them could be analyzed in its own right. Each sonship metaphor had its own context with its own level of emphasis and resonance, its particular focus and frame, and its unique set of implications, albeit with some similarities. Thus, one cannot think of Paul's metaphor in Romans 9:4 unilaterally drawing upon "the sonship tradition," or interpreting each and every occurrence of "sonship" in precisely the same way. Rather, considering the intertextual relationship between Paul's text and other texts in the tradition requires thinking of Paul as both an interpreter of other sonship metaphors, and a creator of his own metaphor with its own point of view that speaks into this tradition.

Paul's text in Romans 9:4 becomes another voice in the conversation of various sources using the sonship texts; each text, as Brawley says "sings in its own voices even as its voices also sing…in harmony, or in discord with voices of the other."[78] Thus the examination below will stress areas of harmony and discord between Paul's metaphor and other metaphors of Israelite sonship. My aim will be to notice themes in other texts that Paul affirms in his use of υἱοθεσία, as well as places where Paul provides a somewhat jarring reinterpretation of the themes found in other texts, while also recognizing that Paul's metaphor represents Paul's own voice. His voice may have been influenced by other voices and variations in the sonship tradition, but the use of the υἱοθεσία metaphor is uniquely Pauline and so we must attune ourselves accordingly to appreciate its variation of an Israelite sonship metaphor.

3.1 The Old Testament Literature

Though the occurrences of the sonship metaphors in the Old Testament are not frequent, nor easily systematized, they do all seem to utilize the vehicle "sonship" to express some aspect of the covenant relationship between YHWH and Israel (e.g.

[78] Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech*, 6.

intimacy, discipline, the faithfulness of YHWH vs. the faithlessness of Israel). The first occurrence of an "Israelite sonship" metaphor in the Old Testament appears in Exodus 4:22:[79] "Thus the Lord says 'Israel is my son, my firstborn' (בְּנִי בְכֹרִי יִשְׂרָאֵל כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה)." In this text God's covenant relationship with Israel, here expressed in terms of sonship, functions as the rationale for his action on Israel's behalf in the exodus event.[80] Furthermore, in the instance of Exodus 4:22 in particular the metaphor has teeth. Brevard Childs remarks that "the threat moves immediately beyond the metaphor to speak in grim, realistic terms of Pharaoh's first-born."[81] Nahum Sarna suggests that we can gain some understanding of Israel's status as firstborn by looking at Pharaoh's punishment. Sarna argues that Israel as the firstborn son was "naturally dedicated to God and in early times had certain cultic prerogatives and obligations. It is this that informs the concomitant demand of verse 23 that Israel be allowed to worship in the wilderness. Denial of this right…will incur appropriate punishment."[82] Sarna's point is further evidenced by the vehicle used to describe Israel's sonship in Exodus 4:22, which is "firstborn (בכר/πρωτότοκος)." By using בכר as its vehicle, the metaphor implies that Israel's status as "firstborn" belongs exclusively to them, since by definition only one can be "firstborn." Thus in Exodus 4:22 the metaphor emphasizes the special, filial connection between YHWH and Israel whereby they "enjoy God's devoted care and protection."[83]

Deuteronomy also contains several "Israelite sonship" metaphors that closely connect Israel's sonship with YHWH's discipline and their moral behavior within the framework of the covenant. After recounting Israel's 40 years of wandering in the wilderness, Deuteronomy 8:5 provides the explanation, "Know then in your heart that as a man disciplines his son, so the LORD your God disciplines you."[84] Walter Brueggemann aptly remarks that the metaphor of "parent-child seeks to put the

---

[79] "Sons of God" in Gen 6:4 is the earliest appearance of the metaphor, but there the phrase is used as a description of angelic beings.

[80] Christoph Berner roots the escalation of the plagues which culminate in the killing of all Egyptian firstborn sons in YHWH's declaration in Exodus 4:22. He states, "Den Grund für diese Zuspitzung bildet die in 4,22b explizierte Vorstellung, Israel sei JHWHs erstgeborener Sohn…*Die in 4,22f. etablierte Perspektive hat die ätiologische Begründung der Erstgeburtsofer aus 13,15 zum Hintergrund* (*Die Exoduserzählung: das literarische Werden einer Ursprungslegende Israels* [FAT 73, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010], 128 [emph. orig.]).

[81] Brevard Childs, *Exodus: A Commentary* (OTL, London: SCM, 1974), 102.

[82] Nahum Sarna, *Exodus* (JPS Torah Commentary, Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1991), 24.

[83] Ibid.

[84] וְיָדַעְתָּ עִם־לְבָבֶךָ כִּי כַּאֲשֶׁר יִיַּסֵּר אִישׁ אֶת־בְּנוֹ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מְיַסְּרֶךָּ

Mosaic summons to obedience on a different basis. There is an affinity between the two parties in which trustful gratitude is appropriate and natural….The wilderness that could have been a profound trauma for Israel is here presented as a place of deep caring and well-being."[85] In addition this is a prime example of the power of metaphor to reframe the Israelite experience of wandering in order to deemphasize the difficulty of the experience and highlight the connection between wandering and their special privilege as sons of YHWH.

With a slightly different emphasis than in Deuteronomy 8:5, Deuteronomy 14:1 uses a sonship metaphor to express Israel's covenant obligations. Here the text reads, "You are sons of the LORD your God, you must not lacerate yourselves or shave your forelocks for the dead."[86] What is perhaps most striking about this occurrence of the metaphor is its construction. Gerhard von Rad notes that the form "sons of YHWH" "is unique in Deuteronomy and in the whole of the Old Testament as well."[87] This is the single instance in the Old Testament where the Israelites are referred to as "sons" (plural) of YHWH, and this designation functions as a rationale for the Israelites to maintain their distance from the practices of other nations.[88] Furthermore, this text in Deuteronomy closely connects the sonship metaphor with the election of Israel. Deuteronomy 14:2 continues, "For you are a people holy to the LORD your God, it is you the LORD has chosen out of all the peoples on earth to be his people, his treasured possession."[89] Here Israel's sonship is presented as an exclusive category that pertains to ethnic Israel as a national and religious entity in contrast with "all the peoples on earth."[90] Brueggemann remarks that "of all the available peoples to whom YHWH might be especially attached, Israel is the one on which YHWH has settled affection, intimacy, and special privilege."[91] It is important to note that

---

[85] Walter Brueggemann, *Deuteronomy* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2001), 106-107.

[86] בָּנִים אַתֶּם לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם לֹא תִתְגֹּדְדוּ וְלֹא־תָשִׂימוּ קָרְחָה בֵּין עֵינֵיכֶם לָמֵת

[87] Gerhard von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, trans. Dorothea Barton (AOTC, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), 101.

[88] Von Rad comments that the purpose of the statement was likely to encourage "refraining from certain ritual practices," and in particular, "all forms of the cult of the dead" (Ibid.); see also A. D. H. Mayes, "Deuteronomy 14 and the Deuteronomic Worldview," in *Studies in Deuteronomy: In Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. F. García Martínez, et. al. (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 165-81.

[89] כִּי עַם קָדוֹשׁ אַתָּה לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ וּבְךָ בָּחַר יְהוָה לִהְיוֹת לוֹ לְעַם סְגֻלָּה מִכֹּל הָעַמִּים אֲשֶׁר עַל־פְּנֵי הָאֲדָמָה

[90] Von Rad comments, "The concept of 'holy' does not denote a particular human quality, but chiefly the idea of being singled out for Yahweh and the idea of the inviolability derived from this" (*Deuteronomy*, 101).

[91] Brueggemann, *Deuteronomy*, 157.

Deuteronomy 14:1 does not present Israel's sonship as conditional upon their behavior. As Brueggemann observes, "Israel's status…is not an outcome of obedience but a premise for obedience, a premise established by YHWH's inexplicable initiative of the relationship."[92] Furthermore, by insisting that the Israelites as the sons of YHWH exhibit behavior that marks them out from other nations, the metaphor in Deuteronomy 14:1 undergirds a sense of unique identity that is created through Israel's sonship.

We see the reverse side of the same connection between moral behavior and sonship later in Deuteronomy 32 in the song of Moses, where Moses chastises the nation of Israel for being "degenerate sons" and "a crooked and perverse generation" (Deut 32:5).[93] Here Israel's offense is against YHWH the "father who created you" (Deut 32:6),[94] whom Israel has forgotten (Deut 32:18).[95] In contrast to the sonship metaphor in Deuteronomy 14:1 where the focus is on the covenant obligations of the sons, in Deuteronomy 32:5 it is YHWH as the faithful father to his disobedient children that is drawn into view.[96] Indeed, as J. G. McConville remarks, "The accusation that Israel has been false is all the more telling for Yahweh's truth and trustworthiness."[97] However, Israel's disobedience in Deuteronomy 32:5 is still presented as the disobedience of *sons*. McConville remarks, "This rebellion flies in the face of *Yahweh's strong attachment to them*."[98] Still, their disobedience results in punishment, not disownment.

Moreover, the text of Deuteronomy 32 presents a more nuanced view of Israel's relationship to other nations. Though Deuteronomy 32:9 calls Israel "the LORD's own portion" from among the nations,[99] later YHWH says, "I will hide my face from them" (Deut 32:20). Richard Nelson remarks that YHWH's action here

---

[92] Ibid.

[93] שִׁחֵת לוֹ לֹא בָנָיו מוּמָם דּוֹר עִקֵּשׁ וּפְתַלְתֹּל (Deut 32:5). Isaiah 1:2 expresses something quite similar: שִׁמְעוּ שָׁמַיִם וְהַאֲזִינִי אֶרֶץ כִּי יְהוָה דִּבֶּר בָּנִים גִּדַּלְתִּי וְרוֹמַמְתִּי וְהֵם פָּשְׁעוּ בִי (“Hear, O heavens, and listen, O earth; for the Lord has spoken: I reared sons and brought them up, but they have rebelled against me”). See also Mal 1:6 for a similar sonship metaphor where Israel's disobedience is presented as rebellion against YHWH as father.

[94] הֲלוֹא־הוּא אָבִיךָ קָנָךְ הוּא עָשְׂךָ וַיְכֹנְנֶךָ (Deut 32:6).

[95] Both father and mother metaphors are predicated of YHWH in the course of Deuteronomy 32, but YHWH's relationship with Israel as "sons" is the tenor of them throughout the chapter.

[96] Von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 196.

[97] J. G. McConville, *Deuteronomy* (Apollos Old Testament Commentary, Leicester: Apollos, 2002), 453.

[98] Ibid. (emph. mine).

[99] (Deut 32:9) שִׁחֵת לוֹ לֹא בָנָיו מוּמָם דּוֹר עִקֵּשׁ וּפְתַלְתֹּל

indicates anger or "revulsion over such behavior."[100] Israel's punishment for their faithlessness is to make them jealous with "what is no people" and provoking them with "a foolish nation" (Deut 32:21).[101] Though the text does not necessarily imply that YHWH has disowned Israel as his son, the wordplay between "what is no god (בְּלֹא־אֵל) /what is no people (בְּלֹא־עָם)" might suggest a reversal in status between Israel and this "non-nation." However, Brueggemann argues that the punishment Israel receives for their foolishness has been predetermined by the covenant conditions. He asserts, "What Israel is to suffer is not due to divine capriciousness, but on the basis of sanctions already known ahead of time."[102] Therefore we might conclude from this text that although Israel has been a faithless son, YHWH is still presented as a disciplining father, and that despite Israel's disobedience, YHWH does not take any other nation to be his own.

There are also several texts in the prophetic literature in the Old Testament that employ variations of an "Israelite sonship" metaphor. In occurrences very much parallel to those in Deuteronomy, Isaiah uses metaphors of sonship both positively as descriptions of YHWH's faithfulness and negatively for Israel's disobedience. In Isaiah 30:1-11, YHWH refers to the Israelites as "stubborn sons (בָּנִים סוֹרְרִים)," "lying sons (בָּנִים כְּחָשִׁים)," and "sons unwilling to hear the instruction of the LORD (יְהוָה בָּנִים לֹא־אָבוּ שְׁמֹועַ תּוֹרַת)." It is significant that the woe oracle begins with YHWH addressing the Israelites *as his sons*. Brevard Childs remarks that here the introductory divine speech "designates the addressee and often the grounds for the ensuing polemic."[103] Under Child's assertion, the addressees of YHWH's polemic are then specifically his sons, the Israelites, and the grounds for the polemic is their disobedience to him.

We see another example of a sonship metaphor in Isaiah 43:6-7 where the people of Israel are gathered from the diaspora as the sons and daughters of YHWH.[104] The construction of the metaphor in Isaiah 43:6-7 is particularly

---

[100] Richard Nelson, *Deuteronomy* (OTL, Louisville: WJK, 2002), 373.
[101] (Deut 32:21) וַאֲנִי אַקְנִיאֵם בְּלֹא־עָם בְּגוֹי נָבָל אַכְעִיסֵם
[102] Brueggemann, *Deuteronomy*, 280.
[103] Brevard Childs, *Isaiah* (OTL, Louisville: WJK, 2001), 224.
[104] Regarding the significance of Israel's gathering Claus Westermann notes, "However important it may be for Israel that God should thus turn to her (v. 4a) and, as a result, effect her redemption, *her* exaltation is not the final goal of the event: it is the glory of God" (*Isaiah 40-66*, trans. David M. G. Stalker [OTL, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969], 119).

interesting because it includes the "daughters" of YHWH alongside his "sons." Of the metaphor, Childs remarks, "The naming of the returning exiles as God's sons and daughters assumes the special relationship of God as father of his family…grounded in Israel's particular covenantal relationship."[105] This text also connects Israel's sonship (and daughterhood) with YHWH as the creator of his covenant people (see also Isa 64:8; Mal 2:10). YHWH who gathers his people from the corners of the earth (Isa 43:5-6), is also the God who created them (Isa 43:1), and brings the Israelites safely through fire, water, and the schemes of their enemies (Isa 43:2-4).

This sonship metaphor in Isaiah 63:7-8 frames YHWH's mercy and covenant faithfulness (חסד) as the care that a father has bestowed on his sons, but unlike other positive uses of the metaphor that employ similar terminology, here the tone of the passage is clearly a lament.[106] The metaphor occurs in a summary of YHWH's gracious acts toward his people, and the text indicates that on account of Israel's sonship, YHWH became the savior of Israel (Isa 63:7), and he redeemed them because of his love (אהב) and mercy (חמל) (Isa 63:9). Unlike some of the other texts we have examined, Isaiah 63:7-8 seems to put a condition on Israel's sonship. YHWH declares "surely they are…sons who will not act falsely," which could be read as a stipulation to their sonship.[107] More likely, however, is that the condition in Isaiah is precisely the kind of covenant condition invoked in Deuteronomy 32. Here again it would seem that it is not Israel's status as son that is at stake, but rather their impending punishment for their rebellion according to the covenant, which the text goes on to describe (Isa 63:10).

Likewise, when Jeremiah looks forward to the restoration of Israel after the exile, he grounds YHWH's action in Israel's sonship. Here YHWH declares, "with consolations I will lead them back…for I have become a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my firstborn" (Jer 31:9).[108] We must also note that Jeremiah uses the language of "a

---

[105] Childs, *Isaiah*, 335.
[106] Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66,* 386.
[107] Westermann perhaps hints at this possibility when he says, "Implicit in this, however, was an expectation—that as his sons they would be loyal and true to him" (ibid., 387).
[108] כִּי־הָיִיתִי לְיִשְׂרָאֵל לְאָב וְאֶפְרַיִם בְּכֹרִי הוּא (Jer 31:9). Though the date of this oracle is a matter of some debate (see Jack R. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 21-36* [ABC, New York: Doubleday, 2004], 420) it is likely that this passage (Jer 31:7-9) is genuinely Jeremiah (see William Holladay, *Jeremiah: Spokesman Out of Time* [Philadelphia: Pilgrim, 1974], 107-21) and should be dated "either in Josiah's reign or close to the fall of Jerusalem" (Lundbom, *Jeremiah 21-36*, 420).

remnant" being brought back (Jer 31:7).[109] However, the prophetic use of "remnant (שְׁאֵרִית יִשְׂרָאֵל)" is only distantly connected to the Pauline concept of the remnant that I will examine in greater detail below. E. W. Heaton demonstrates that the term "remnant" in Jeremiah (and the whole of the OT) "primarily directs attention not forward to the residue, but *backwards* to the whole of which it had been a part."[110] The same sentiment is echoed in Hosea 2:1 (1:10), where in a dramatic shift in tone from Hosea 1:6-9, the sons of Israel are renamed "sons of the living God."[111] Remarking on this striking reversal of Israel's fortune, Andersen and Freedman observe, "It is part of Yahweh's sovereign power that he can completely reverse anything. He can change 'my people' into 'not my people,' and he can reverse the direction too."[112] Hosea's depiction of Israel's sonship here looks forward to their future restoration, rather than the metaphor describing their present state (e.g. Exod 4:22), or providing a rationale for their particular behavior (e.g. Deut 14:1). Andersen and Freedmen comment, "[T]he historical entity Israel is remythologized and cast into the future as the eschatological community."[113] In these passages it is important to note that it is not Israel's repentance that leads to YHWH's declaration of renewed sonship. Rather, these passages represent YHWH's paradigmatic action toward his sons that initiates their restoration and repentance.

Though the sonship metaphors in these Old Testament texts contain different emphases and are used in different contexts, very broad generalizations can be made regarding "Israelite sonship" metaphors as a group. The preferred terms for the vehicles of the "Israelite sonship" metaphors are generic, and derived from the Hebrew root בֵּן translated "son" or "sons" (e.g. Exod 4:22; Deut 8:5; 14:1-2; 32:20; Isa 30:1; Isa 43:6-7; Isa 63:8; Hos 2:1 [1:10]), though occasionally Israel is referred to more specifically as the "firstborn" (בְּכֹר) of YHWH. The "Israelite sonship" metaphors tend to use sonship to express various aspects of YHWH's covenant

---

[109] There is considerable consensus among OT scholars that the original Hebrew (based on a reconstruction of T and the LXX) reads הושיע יהוה את עמו (YHWH has saved his people) and that the MT imperative הוֹשַׁע is incorrect. Holladay remarks, "The form of the text in *M*...is understandable, given the pressures of the postexilic period, but surely wrong" (*Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, chapters 26-52*, ed. Paul D. Hanson [Hermeneia, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989], 184.

[110] E. W. Heaton, "The Root שאר and the Doctrine of the Remnant," *JTS* 3.1 (1952): 29.

[111] וְהָיָה בִּמְקוֹם אֲשֶׁר־יֵאָמֵר לָהֶם לֹא־עַמִּי אַתֶּם יֵאָמֵר לָהֶם בְּנֵי אֵל־חָי (Hos 2:1 HMT).

[112] Francis I. Andersen, and David Noel Freedman, *Hosea* (ABC, New York: Doubleday, 1980), 199-200.

[113] Ibid., 207.

relationship with them. In some instances sonship metaphors are used in order to evoke a particular behavior from the Israelites, in others the metaphor provides a framework through which the Israelites can understand YHWH's disciplinary actions toward them (e.g. Deut 8:5; 32:5-6; Isa 30:1-11; Hos 1:6-9). Furthermore, in most of the texts where Israel is punished they are punished as *sons of YHWH who have broken the covenant* (see esp. Deut 32:19-21; Isa 30:1-11). Sonship metaphors also often appear in close connection with YHWH's election of Israel to be his chosen people, and Israel's sonship is sometimes set in contrast with "other nations" (e.g. Deut 14:1-2; 32:20; Isa 43:3-7). As Byrne notes, "Sonship is the unique privilege of Israel as the people chosen and created by Yahweh for himself."[114] "Israelite sonship" can also be used to highlight YHWH's faithfulness to his people, and at least Hosea 2:1 connects YHWH's faithfulness to the eschatological restoration of the Israelites as sons of YHWH. Lastly, none of the occurrences of "Israelite sonship" metaphors refer to an explicit instance of adoption, nor does any occurrence obviously imply that the quality of Israel's sonship is to be understood as adoption.[115] In light of this evidence, one possible explanation for Paul's use of υἱοθεσία as a term for Israel's sonship is that Paul has coined a new term that possibly reinterprets facets of the framework of sonship constructed by the "Israelite sonship" metaphors in the Old Testament.

3.2 The Intertestamental Literature

In labeling the literature in this section "intertestamental," I do not wish to make a specific claim regarding the date of this literature (either as post-dating the entirety of the Old Testament or as ante-dating the New Testament), but rather to address a group of sources from various dates and provenances that provide a reflection on the Old Testament literature and which have clearly been influenced by Hellenism and apocalypticism. I also note here that although there are numerous instances where the term "son of God" appears in intertestamental sources in

---

[114] Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 16.

[115] *Pace* Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 96-120, 205-13, Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in Israel and Later Judaism*, trans. G. W. Anderson (Nashville: Abingdon, 1956), 78. Andersen and Freedman also fail to distinguish between metaphorical adoption and metaphorical birth in their analysis, saying "it is clear that the title 'child' is conferred by adoption….[The Israelites] abhorred the idea of people as the offspring of God, not to belittle people, but to protect Yahweh from any suggestion of sexuality" (*Hosea*, 206). However, metaphorical predications that rely on birth imagery for their models (e.g. בכר in Jer 31:9) do not imply "sexuality," and calling Israel's sonship "adoptive" unnecessarily introduces a foreign and anachronistic concept (adoption) into the discussion.

connection with angelic figures, messianic figures, and wise people,[116] I again will focus only on those texts where "Israelite sonship" metaphors appear, since these texts provide the most direct parallel with the Pauline usage in Romans 9:4. Furthermore, due to the large number of references to "Israelite sonship" it is necessary to limit this analysis to those passages where the metaphor is emphatic or resonant in its own right, or to texts where unique terminology for Israel's sonship is used.

3.2.1 Israelite Sonship in the Book of Wisdom

Two passages from the book of Wisdom contain highly developed versions of an "Israelite sonship" metaphor: 12:19-22, and 18:1-4.[117] These metaphors both occur in the section of Wisdom devoted to the salvation of God's people in the exodus event, and in each the metaphor is being used to communicate Israel's sense of national identity. Although Byrne argues in his treatment of Wisdom that Israel functions as the "type" of the just in chapters 10-19,[118] Barclay's case that Wisdom represents a "deeply Hellenized exercise in cultural aggression," where the "predominant theme…is in fact the social conflict and cultural antagonism between Jews and non-Jews"[119] provides a much more compelling backdrop for the sonship theme.

The first passage, Wisdom 12:19-22, occurs within an extended reflection of Israel's salvation in the exodus event (Wis 11-19). This example of an "Israelite

---

[116] See Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 9-78.

[117] There is also an Israelite sonship metaphor in Wis 16:24-26, but it is not quite as well-developed and contains similar themes to 12:19-22 and 18:1-4 and so it will be omitted from the discussion below. The one notable difference in the metaphor is the role of creation in caring for the sons of YHWH and punishing their enemies. Samuel Cheon remarks, "Creation works for the salvation of the righteous and the judgment of the unrighteous….In the plagues the cosmic elements worked to punish the Egyptians, whereas in the wilderness events they served to benefit the Israelites" (*The Exodus Story in the Wisdom of Solomon: A Study in Biblical Interpretation* [JSPSup 23, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997], 123.

[118] Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 44 n. 129.

[119] John M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE-117 CE* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 33, Berkley: University of California Press, 1996), 184. Robert Siebeneck expresses similar sentiment: "A justification of the Jewish way of life, stated in terms of Greek culture and with its finesse, was the need of the moment. The book is therefore a rhetorical exhortation, intended to encourage, reassure, and revitalize the Jews in Alexandria by restating the case for Hebrew wisdom ("The Midrash of Wisdom 10-19," *CBQ* 22 (1960): 176. Cheon attempts to pinpoint the date and provenance of the book even more precisely to the riots in Alexandria in 38 CE (*Exodus Story*, 147).

sonship" metaphor is striking precisely because the metaphor illuminates the "conflict between the Jewish community and others."[120] Wisdom 12:19-22 reads,

> Through such works you have taught your people that the righteous must be kind, and you have filled your sons with good hope (καὶ εὐέλπιδας ἐποίησας τοὺς υἱούς σου), because you give repentance for sins. For if you punished with such great care and indulgence the enemies of your servants/children (εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὺς παίδων σου) and those deserving of death, granting them time and opportunity to give up their wickedness, with what strictness you have judged your sons (μετὰ πόσης ἀκριβείας ἔκρινας τοὺς υἱούς σου), to whose ancestors you gave oaths and covenants full of good promises! So while chastening us you scourge our enemies ten thousand times more, so that, when we judge, we may meditate upon your goodness, and when we are judged, we may expect mercy.

In this text the sonship metaphor contains connotations of exclusivity (τοὺς υἱούς σου vs. ἐχθροὺς παίδων σου), which from the context are, in fact, ethnic divisions between the Israelites and the Egyptians. God is punishing not his own enemies but the enemies of his children. Moreover, Wisdom 12:19-22 contains a sharp contrast between God's disciplinary action towards Israel as sons which is depicted as redemptive, and his actions toward other nations which are retributive. The Israelites are "chastened," while their enemies are "scourged." This contrast could be evidence of what Cheon labels the "apologetic tendency" of Wisdom. He states that the "definition of the Israelites as 'the righteous' and the Egyptians as 'the wicked' can be also considered as apologetic counteraction."[121] The dichotomy between the Israelite sons and the enemy Egyptians in this text is likely intended to reinforce the boundary between the author's Jewish audience and their Hellenistic milieu, and thus the sonship metaphor in this text serves to undergird their distinctive cultural identity.

Another prominent "Israelite sonship" metaphor follows on the heels of the author's description of the plague of darkness that falls upon the Egyptians. Drawing a stark contrast between the Israelites and the Egyptians, chapter 18 describes the situation of the Israelites as full of light, illuminated by YHWH. Here we read,

> But for your holy ones there was very great light. Their enemies heard their voices but did not see their forms, and counted them happy for not having suffered, and were thankful that your holy ones, though previously wronged, were doing them no injury; and they begged their pardon for having been at variance with them. Therefore you provided

[120] Cheon, *Exodus Story*, 145.
[121] Ibid., 149.

> a flaming pillar of fire as a guide for your people's unknown journey, and a harmless sun for their glorious wandering. For their enemies deserved to be deprived of light and imprisoned in darkness, those who had kept your sons imprisoned (οἱ κατακλείστους φυλάξαντες τοὺς υἱούς σου), through whom the imperishable light of the law was to be given to the world (18:1-4).

The most striking feature of this example is perhaps its polemical tone toward Israel's enemies, who "deserved to be deprived of light" for their treatment of YHWH's sons.[122] In contrast, Israel's sonship is spoken of in glowing terms, set alongside their receiving of the law as an "imperishable light (τὸ ἄφθαρτον νόμου φῶς)." The connection of law and sonship is likely meant to evoke the giving of the law and the confirmation of the Mosaic covenant in Exodus 20-24. This statement might perhaps, as some have argued, recognize "the world-wide mission of the Jewish nation."[123] However, it is more likely that this passage both represents and "shapes the self-perception and self-understanding of the Jewish community."[124] Under this reading the "Israelite sonship" metaphor is employed to remind the Jewish audience of their unique identity as the chosen people of YHWH—his sons who have been entrusted with the law. The combination of "holy ones" (τοῖς ὁσίοις in Wis 18:1) and the "Israelite sonship" metaphor also indicates a connection between election and sonship, though since there is no direct reference to YHWH's creation of Israel it is perhaps not as strong here as in some other texts examined above (e.g. Deut 32:6-20; Isa 43:1-7).

3.2.2 Israelite Sonship in Joseph and Aseneth

The inclusion of an "Israelite sonship" metaphor in *Joseph and Aseneth* merits consideration because the narrative focuses so heavily on the conversion of Aseneth, a gentile.[125] Because her conversion occupies such a central place in the story, much of the dramatic action that takes place is the result of the tension between the narrative's two groups of people: Jews and gentiles. Randall Chesnutt observes,

---

[122] ἄξιοι μὲν γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι στερηθῆναι φωτὸς

[123] J. A. F. Gregg, *The Wisdom of Solomon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), 171; see also Louis Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 293.

[124] John J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (OTL, Louisville: WJK Press, 1997), 154.

[125] Although Ross Shepard Kraemer's recent work has called the date, setting, and narrative focus of *Joseph and Aseneth* into question, further study is needed to confirm the late date (4th century C.E.) and Christian setting she posits (*When Aseneth Met Joseph: A Late Antique Tale of the Biblical Patriarch and His Egyptian Wife, Reconsidered* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998], 225-85).

"[L]anguage has as its primary function here that of setting the Jew apart from the non-Jew and justifying the social separation which the former must maintain from the latter."[126] Following Chesnutt, I would argue that the Israelite sonship metaphor in *Joseph and Aseneth* functions to undergird the social, religious, and even ethnic boundaries around the Jewish community presented in the story. However, *Joseph and Aseneth* also presents a unique difficulty because it is difficult to pinpoint the precise characteristics of the Judaism it describes. C. Burchard notes that if "we ask what Judaism as depicted in Joseph and Aseneth is like, it is easier to say what it is not."[127] Though the narrative of *Joseph and Aseneth* ostensibly opens the possibility for non-Jews to participate in the blessing and fellowship of the Jews as members of the covenant community, it seems that it is still largely governed by a culturally antagonistic mindset toward gentiles and their practices.[128] Below I will examine this tone vis-à-vis the sonship metaphor, which provides an interesting perspective on Aseneth's identity prior to and after her conversion.

Though *Joseph and Aseneth* contains numerous non-Israelite references to "son of God (i.e. angels or royal figures),"[129] the discussion will be limited to the Israelite sonship metaphor in 19.8. Once she has undergone her conversion, Joseph calls Aseneth a "City of Refuge," and lauds her "because the *sons of the living God* will dwell in your City of Refuge, and the Lord God will reign as king over them for ever and ever" (*Jos. Asen.* 19.8).[130] Moreover, Aseneth later receives the designation "Daughter of the Most High" alongside Joseph, who is the "firstborn son of God"

---

[126] Randall D. Chesnutt, "The Social Setting and Purpose of Joseph and Aseneth," *JSP* 2 (1988): 24.
[127] C. Burchard, "Joseph and Aseneth," in *OTP*, vol.2, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983), 194.
[128] Burchard remarks that "Proselytes are welcomed, not sought, *and conversion certainly is not an easy affair*" (ibid.,195 [emph. mine]). This cultural antagonism is seen particularly clearly in Joseph's revulsion of Aseneth, and the necessity of Aseneth's thorough conversion and repudiation of her former way of life and religion before she is acceptable as a bride (e.g. 8.5-11; 9.1; 10.12-17; 11.3-5, 16-18; 12.5-15; 19.5).
[129] Joseph is repeatedly referred to as a "son of God" throughout the text of *Joseph and Aseneth* and these occurrences are particularly difficult to categorize, though they share much in common with texts where "son of God" refers to an angelic figure or to royal sonship passages (e.g. 6.5, 13.13-14; 14.9-10; 18.11; 21.4.
[130] Byrne sees the reference in *Jos. Asen.* 19.8 as an example of Gentile inclusion in the designation "sons of God." He states "The 'sons' include now the Gentiles (as proselytes) who, like Asenath, have won a share in the sonship privilege of Israel by repentance and conversion to the true God," *"Sons of God,"* 53. However, Byrne might move too quickly in equating "sons of the living God" in 19.8 with the "many nations" who take refuge in Aseneth in 15.7 and 19.6. In the context of 19.8 there is nothing that indicates that the designation has been extended beyond the confines of ethnic Israel, or that Joseph has reinterpreted Hos 2:1 to apply to gentile proselytes. Rather, in 19.8 it is Aseneth who is held up as the proselyte *par excellence,* evidenced by her designation as "City of Refuge" for the ethnic people of Israel alongside the people of "many nations."

(21.4). From these descriptions there is little doubt that Aseneth has gained full inclusion in the covenant people of Israel, which makes this "Israelite sonship" reference important because it would seem that under certain circumstances "Israelite sonship" can be extended to gentiles.

However, while the author of *Joseph and Aseneth* seems set on portraying Aseneth as worthy not only as a wife to Joseph, but also of full inclusion in the Israelite community, he also takes great pains to show that Aseneth is not like other Egyptian women (1.5) and that she was a virtuous virgin (1.4-6; 2.1; 7.8). He also documents her ostracism from her family and friends in order to show that she has completely separated from her gentile origins (11.4-6; 12.12-14; 13.1). Chesnutt observes, "The frequency and variety of means by which he labors to verify [Aseneth's right to inclusion] suggests the existence in his Jewish world of some less favorable opinions about the proselyte."[131] Furthermore, the author of *Joseph and Aseneth* seems quite preoccupied with demonstrating that the distinct identity of the Israelites is maintained despite Aseneth's inclusion. Indeed, Aseneth has undergone so much of a transformation that she is nearly unrecognizable as the gentile princess from the start of the narrative. In light of the author's concern to maintain a distinct Jewish identity, I would suggest that rather than *Joseph and Aseneth* widening the possible scope of "sons of God" to apply also to gentiles, the effect is quite the reverse. That Aseneth is counted a "daughter of the Most High" alongside the "sons of God," in fact, highlights the metaphor's use as a designation for the Israelites who are God's people distinct from other nations.

3.2.3 Israelite Sonship in 3 Maccabees

Third Maccabees contains two important occurrences of the sonship metaphor that occur in close succession and together provide an interesting lens onto the concerns and persuasions of the author, whom H. Anderson describes as "a staunch conservative, swimming against the stream of the more radical tendencies of his time."[132] This is particularly true with the first occurrence of the sonship metaphor, which is placed on the lips of the tyrant Philopater who declares,

---

[131] Chesnutt, "Social Setting and Purpose," 33.
[132] H. Anderson, "3 Maccabees," in *OTP,* vol. 2, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983), 514. Similarly, Barclay remarks that *3 Maccabees* is "so evidently fictional as to render it

> [27]Loose, yes loose completely their [the Israelites'] unrighteous bonds. Send them back to their homes in peace, asking their forgiveness for what has been done to them. [28]Release the sons of the all-conquering, living God of heaven (ἀπολύσατε τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἐπουρανίου θεοῦ ζῶντος) (*3 Macc* 6.27-28).

The narrator then gives a rejoinder that echoes the same sentiment a few verses later saying, "knowing of a surety that God in heaven protects the Jews, in alliance with them continually like a father with his sons (*3 Macc*. 7.6)."[133] The identity of the Israelites as the sons of YHWH is affirmed both by the Gentile king and by the narrator, and both speakers use the metaphor in a way that underscores the particularism of the Jewish people.[134] Of *3 Macc* 7.6 Andersen remarks, "Our author gives no sign at all of being possessed of any proselytizing zeal or of moving beyond the particularism of which the pagan Philopater is here made the eloquent spokesman."[135] Furthermore, *3 Maccabees* uses the sonship metaphor as a rationale to explain the actions of YHWH on behalf of his people, which is also a prominent theme throughout the book (e.g. 2.2-20; 6.2-15). Here we see that Israel's sonship is connected with YHWH's continual care and "alliance with them" as their father (7:6-7). Thus in *3 Maccabees* the Israelite sonship metaphor is intimately connected with Jewish particularism and an assurance that *their God* works in history for the sake of his glory and on behalf of his people, Israel (2.2-20; 5.7; 6.2-15).

3.2.3 The Sonship Tradition in Sirach, Judith, and Psalms of Solomon

In Sirach the "Israelite sonship" metaphor combines a prayer for the eschatological restoration of Israel[136] with Israel's designation as YHWH's firstborn, undoubtedly drawing on Exodus 4:22 ("Israel is my firstborn son") and Jeremiah 31:9 ("Ephraim is my firstborn") where the designation "firstborn" (בחר) is also used. Sirach 36:16-17 reads,

---

comparatively easy to detect here the fears and aspirations of its Jewish author" (*Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 192).

[133] καὶ τὸν ἐπουράνοιν θεὸν ἐγνωκότες ἀσφαλῶς ὑπερησπικότα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὡς πατέρα ὑπὲρ υἱῶν διὰ παντὸς συμμαχοῦντα.

[134] The preservation of Jewish identity is evidently of great concern to the author of *3 Maccabees* (2.31-33; 3.4-7; 5.13-14; 7.10-12).

[135] Andersen, "3 Maccabees," 514.

[136] Martin Hengel notes, "Ben Sira shows a considerable *political interest* in a nationalistic Jewish sense, which culminates in a completely this-worldly expectation of salvation for his people" (*Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, vol. 1, trans. John Bowden [London: SCM Press, 1974], 134).

> [16]Gather all the tribes of Jacob,
> and give them their inheritance, as at the beginning.
> [17]Have mercy, O Lord, on the people called by your name,
> on Israel, whom you have named your firstborn (ὃν πρωτογόνῳ).

This passage occurs as part of a passionate prayer in which the author petitions YHWH to "lift up [his] hand toward foreign nations" (Sir 36:3),[137] declares that God has providentially used Israel to "show [his] holiness to them [other nations]," and asks now that he use the nations (by destroying them) to "show [his] glory to us" (Sir 36:4). Otto Kaiser remarks that 36:15-17 makes evident "that God may stand by his promises to Israel and thus lead all nations to recognize his eternal godhead."[138] Within this prayer for eschatological restoration, "Israelite sonship" is functioning primarily as an expression of national identity; the "sons" are set in contrast to the other nations who are enemies of Israel. John Collins calls the prayer in Sirach 36 "a highly particular judgment on the enemies of Israel."[139] The elective nature of Israel's sonship is also an undercurrent throughout this passage, as the sons of Israel are described as "called" and "named" (36:17). [140] Thus the picture of "Israelite sonship" in Sirach 36 is striking because of its combination of nationalistic particularity, election, and eschatological expectation—three themes we will also encounter below in Paul's version of Israelite sonship.

The "Israelite sonship" metaphor in Judith is fairly unmarked,[141] though it occurs in the context of a prayer laden with the language of nation and covenant. John Craghan remarks, "in her lament [Judith] presupposes that Israel's problem has now

---

[137] Theophil Middendorp has argued that the prayer is not part of the original text (*Die Stellung Jesus Ben Siras zwichen Judentum und Hellenismus* [Leiden: Brill, 1973], 125-32). However, Johannes Marböck ('Sir 38, 24-39, 11: Der schriftgelhrt Weise', in *La Sagesse de l'Ancien Testament*, ed. M. Gilbert [Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1979], 293-316), Patrick Skehan, and Alexander A. Di Lella (*The Wisdom of Ben Sira* [ABC, Garden City: Doubleday, 1987], 418) and Georg Sauer (*Jesus Sirach/Ben Sira* [Das Alte Testament deutsch Apokryphen 1, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000], 249) defend the prayer as authentic.

[138] Otto Kaiser, "Covenant and Law in Ben Sira," in *Covenant as Context: Essays in Honour of E. W. Nicholson*, eds. A. D. H. Mayes and R. B. Salters (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 253.

[139] Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 110.

[140] Sigurd Grindheim rightly remarks that "Ben Sira's focus is not on election but on the correlative concept of wisdom, whose acquisition is contingent upon an active choice (6:22, 32-33). Ben Sira is not concerned with a precise definition of the community of the elect" (*The Crux of Election: Paul's Critique of the Jewish Confidence in the Election of Israel* [WUNT II 202, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005], 39.

[141] Carey Moore observes, "[I]f most, or at least many, of the important ideas of Judaism exist in Judith…they do not seem alive and vibrant. In short, this is not one of the great prayers of the Apocrypha" (*Judith* [ABC, Garden City: Doubleday, 1985], 60).

become God's problem."[142] In her prayer, Judith prostrates herself before God and begs,

> [12]Please, please, God of my father, God of the heritage of Israel, Lord of heaven and earth, Creator of the waters, King of all your creation, hear my prayer! [13]Make my deceitful words bring wound and bruise on those who have planned cruel things against your covenant, and against your sacred house, and against Mount Zion, and against the house your sons possess. [14]Let your whole nation and every tribe know and understand that you are God, the God of all power and might, and that there is no other who protects the people of Israel but you alone! (Jdt 9:12-14).

It is significant that the "Israelite sonship" metaphor occurs within the context of a prayer, as "the theological views and values of the author are skillfully conveyed…explicitly by statements in the speeches, prayers, and conversations of the characters."[143] The vocabulary in Judith's version of an "Israelite sonship" metaphor is not striking (υἱῶν σου), but it is striking that the metaphor itself occurs in a prayer which affirms both God's universalism as "king of all creation," and God's particular relationship with Israel ("God of my father," "God of the heritage"). Though Israel's God is God over all, Craghan remarks that Judith "cannot envision a dual nationalism. In Judith to opt for Yahweh is to destroy the enemy."[144] Furthermore, Israelite sonship is explicitly linked with God's covenant, which is also the only time "covenant" appears in the book. For Judith, Israel's sonship is undoubtedly functioning as an expression of national and ethnic identity,[145] and YHWH, as the father of Israel, is portrayed in the manner of "deity as warrior."[146]

Given that the *Psalms of Solomon*, especially *Psalm of Solomon* 17, have been the recent subject of a considerable amount of New Testament research,[147] and also

---

[142] John F. Craghan, "Esther, Judith, and Ruth: Paradigms for Human Liberation," *BTB* 12 (1982): 13.
[143] Moore, *Judith*, 60.
[144] Craghan, "Esther, Judith, and Ruth," 17.
[145] Benedikt Eckhardt points out that in Judith, "Israel" appears 50 times, suggesting that "Judith accumulates ethnically based vocabulary to mark identity and alterity" ("Reclaiming Tradition: The Book of Judith and Hasmonean Politics," *JSP* 18 (2009): 257-58.
[146] Linda Day, "Faith, Character, and Perspective in Judith," *JSOT* 95 (2001): 80. For more on Judith's character and the character of Judith's God see ibid., 73-91.
[147] See especially Mikael Winninge, *Sinners and the Righteous: A Comparative Study of the Psalms of Solomon and Paul's Letters* (ConBNT 26, Stockholm: Almqvist &Wiskell, 1995); Kenneth Atkinson, *An Intertextual Study of the Psalms of Solomon* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 49, Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001); see also Marinus de Jonge, *Jesus, the Servant Messiah* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), 70-77; Grindheim, *The Crux of Election*, 48-53; Wayne A. Meeks, "Asking Back to Jesus' Identity," in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge,* ed. Martinus C. De Boer (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic

given that there is considerable diversity of opinion in regard to its occasion and religious setting,[148] attempting to address the emphasis and function of the "Israelite sonship" metaphors within the *Psalms of Solomon* presents us with potential difficulties. Athough it would undoubtedly be helpful to the interpretive task, determining the precise occasion or setting of the document is unnecessary for elucidating, in general terms, how the Israelite sonship metaphor is being used in the text. If the purpose of the *Psalms of Solomon* is to respond to a crisis situation,[149] and, as Embry states, "was intended to convey the need for religious fidelity and to encourage the Jewish community,"[150] then part of the task here is to examine how the "Israelite sonship" metaphors might reflect this mindset and contribute to this task.

Both examples of "Israelite sonship" metaphors in the *Psalms of Solomon* contain nationalistic undertones, although the nationalism in *Psalms of Solomon* is combined with the insistence that a restored nation of Israel will be comprised only of the righteous (e.g. 3.11-12; 13.9-12; 15.10-13; 17.26-32; 18.5). The "Israelite

---

Press, 1993), 38-50; Collins, "The *Son of God* Text from Qumran," 69-73. For a summary and critique of *Psalms of Solomon* research in New Testament studies see Brad Embry, "The *Psalms of Solomon* and the New Testament: Intertextuality and the Need for a Re-Evaluation," *JSP* 13 (2002): 99-136.

[148] For an overview of the positions regarding the setting and community of the document see Robert B. Wright, *The Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Edition* (Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies 1), New York: T & T Clark, 2007, 1-12; Joseph Trafton ,"Psalms of Solomon in Recent Research," *JSP* 6 (1994): 7-8. Grindheim summarizes the five main views as "1) Qumran-Essene, 2) non-Qumran-Essene, 3) Pharisaic, 4) Hasidic, 5) an unknown sect" (*The Crux of Election*, 48). For a defense of Qumran origin see André Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings from Qumran*, trans. Géza Vèrmes (Oxford: Blackwell, 1961), 296. R. B. Wright entertains the possibility of a non-Qumran Essene sect ("Psalms of Solomon," in *OTP*, vol. 2, ed. James H. Charlesworth [Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983], 642); see also R. B. Wright, "The Psalms of Solomon, the Pharisees, and the Essenes," in *1972 Proceedings: International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies and the Society of Biblical Literature Pseudepigrapha Seminar*, ed. Robert A. Kraft (Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972), 141-46; Robert Hann, "The Community of the Pious: the Social Setting of the *Psalms of Solomon*," *SR* 17 (1988): 169-89. For a defense of the traditional Pharisaic origin see Joachim Schüpphaus, *Die Psalmen Salomos: Ein Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts* (ALGHJ 7, Leiden: Brill, 1977). See Winninge, *Sinners and the Righteous*, 170-80 for the view that the *Psalms of Solomon* were produced by the same group of Hasidim from which the Pharisees emerged (see also Jerry O'Dell, "The Religious Background of the Psalms of Solomon [Re-evaluated in the Light of the Qumran Texts]," *RevQ* 3 [1961]: 257-58). Kenneth Atkinson argues that the *Psalms of Solomon* are the product of an unknown Jewish sect, ("Towards a Redating of the Psalms of Solomon: Implications for Understanding the *Sitz im Leben* of an Unknown Jewish Sect," *JSP* 17 [1998]: 112). Charlesworth, in an editorial comment at the end of Wright's introduction in *OTP* remarks, "It is unwise to label these psalms as either Pharisaic or Essene….The recognition that some ideas in these psalms are similar to those among the Pharisees or among the Essenes ignores the fact that these two sects were very similar…[and] most Jews were not members of a sect…hence it is unwise to force these psalms into a model of the Pharisees or Essenes" ("Psalms of Solomon," 642).

[149] See Robert B. Wright, and V. Schwartz, "Psalms of Solomon: Theological Importance," in *OTP*, vol. 2, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983), 643.

[150] Embry, "The *Psalms of Solomon*," 135.

sonship" metaphors look forward to this future restoration of Israel, which rests on the hope that "Israel is [God's] beloved nation, with whom he has an enduring covenant."[151] In addition to some of the themes we have seen in other texts, the "Israelite sonship" metaphor in *Psalm of Solomon* 17.26-29 contains the added element of a Messiah.[152] The text reads:

> He will gather a holy people whom he will lead in righteousness; and he will judge the tribes of the people that have been made holy by the Lord their God. He will not tolerate unrighteousness (even) to pause among them, and any person who knows wickedness shall not live with them. For he shall know them that they are all sons of their God (γνώσεται γὰρ αὐτοὺς ὅτι πάντες υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν αὐτῶν). He will distribute them upon the land according to their tribes; the alien and the foreigner will no longer live near them.

In this text, the focus is on the Messiah-figure gathering and restoring the righteous of Israel. This psalm is interesting because although the author uses "sons of their God" as a designation for the Israelites, he also assumes that YHWH and his Messiah will only deliver those Israelites who are righteous. The author contrasts the "sons" (17:27) or a "holy people" (17:26) with "sinners…to whom you did not make the promise," who from the context of the Psalm are most likely the Hasmonean usurpers.[153] These "sinners" are contrasted with "the lawless one" who "did in Jerusalem all the things that gentiles do for their gods in their cities" (17:14).[154] Rather than sonship being automatically extended to ethnic Israel, in this passage "sonship" is reserved for the righteous and holy Israelites.[155] Moreover, the Messiah

---

[151] Wright and Schwartz, "Psalms of Solomon: Theological Importance," 644.

[152] By using the term "Messiah" here I am by no means making a claim that the Messiah in this text, or other pseudepigraphal texts, is entirely synonymous with the New Testament's portrayal of Jesus as the Messiah. Indeed, my point is to highlight the differences in the treatment of both Israelites and the Messiah between author of the *Psalms of Solomon* who continues to use "firstborn son" to refer to Israel in a text with a Messiah-figure, and Paul who reserves "firstborn" for Christ as Messiah, and uses υἱοθεσία to designate Israel's sonship. For an overview of the diversity of messianic beliefs in early Judaism see William Horbury, "Messianism in the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha," in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*, ed. John Day (JSOTSup 270, Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1998), 402-433; John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995); James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992).

[153] See Wright, "Psalms of Solomon," 641-42.

[154] Most identify "the lawless one" as Pompey (see Wright, "Psalms of Solomon," 641; Hann, "The Community of the Pious," 172), however Atkinson argues that *Pss. Sol.* 17 was redacted by a later sect and instead refers to Herod ("On the Herodian Origin of Militant Davidic Messianism at Qumran: New Light from *Psalm of Solomon* 17," *JBL* 118.3 [1999]: 435-60).

[155] Embry remarks, "They are no longer Israelites simply because they were born Israelites" ("The *Psalms of Solomon*," 121).

takes action against both the Judean "sinners" and the gentiles. The Son of David "will smash the arrogance of sinners (17.23)," and "purge Jerusalem of the gentiles (17.22)," and "there will be no unrighteous among [the righteous] in those days" (17.32).[156] We see in the author's use of the metaphor that "Israelite sonship" belongs to the more narrowly defined group of righteous Israelites.[157] However, it must also be noted that the designation "sons of their God" (υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν αὐτῶν) is still restricted to a select group of ethnic Israelites—that is, the text does not indicate that sonship is extended to any non-Jews who are "righteous" (see esp. 17.28-30, 44-45). As Wright remarks, "The writer is no universalist….No hope is offered for [gentile] conversion."[158] Indeed, one of the blessings for the righteous Israelites is that "the alien and the foreigner will no longer live near them" (17:29).

Psalm of Solomon 18 uses an Israelite sonship metaphor that paraphrases and elaborates on Deuteronomy 8:5 and Proverbs 3:12. In *Psalm of Solomon* 18:4-5 the psalmist states,

> Your discipline for us (is) as (for) a firstborn son, an only child, to divert the perceptive person from unintentional sins. May God cleanse Israel for the day of mercy in blessing, for the appointed day when his Messiah will reign (18:4-5).

As in the previous example, the "Israelite sonship" metaphor here looks forward to the day of Israel's cleansing and restoration, but it combines this expectation with an interpretation of the present sufferings of the righteous. Grindheim argues that the discipline metaphor is the key to understanding the author's viewpoint regarding God's action toward Israel. He states, "The divine discipline of Israel thus has the function of purging the nation."[159] Furthermore, the vocabulary of this example is fascinating to consider. In this text Israel is not only God's firstborn son (υἱὸς πρωτότοκος) but an only child (μονογενής). The addition of μονογενής alone represents an interesting development in the "Israelite sonship" metaphor tradition, but even more significant for our purposes is that both πρωτότοκος and μονογενής

---

[156] This does not necessarily mean that the author views sonship as contingent upon righteous behavior, although we see that the "sinners" arise because of the "sins" of Israel. However, the "sins" mentioned in 17:5 presumably do not disqualify the "sons" from their sonship. Later the sons are restored to Jerusalem while the Psalmist pleads with YHWH to "drive out the sinners from the inheritance" (17:23).

[157] The restriction of sonship to "the righteous" does not necessarily lead us to the conclusion that the *Psalms of Solomon* is a sectarian document; see O'Dell, "Religious Background," 252.

[158] Wright, "Psalms of Solomon," 645.

[159] Grindheim, *The Crux of Election*, 50-51.

appear as designations for Israel *in a Messianic text*. Although the *Psalms of Solomon* contain a highly developed example of a Messianic figure, the author still maintains "firstborn" and "only child" as designations for Israel. These two designations (πρωτότοκος and μονογενής) are reserved for Christ alone in the writings of the New Testament (e.g. Rom 8:29; Col 1:15, 18; Heb 1:6; Rev 1:5; John 1:14, 18; 3:16, 18; 1 John 4:9), while Paul opts for υἱοθεσία as an expression of Israel's sonship.[160]

3.2.4 Some Conclusions on the Sonship Metaphor

Given the diversity of the texts and their various settings and themes just surveyed, it seems almost futile to attempt any systemization of the "Israelite sonship" metaphor from these texts. Indeed, it is not in the nature of metaphors to be systematized. However, in order to proceed with a comparison of these metaphors with the Pauline use of υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4, I will attempt to draw some broad conclusions about "Israelite sonship" metaphors in other Jewish texts. First, we have seen in all of the examples that Israel is designated as either "son," "firstborn," or once as "only child," or its people are "sons" of YHWH. The vocabulary of "adoption" (εἰσποιεῖν, ἐκποιεῖν, τίθεσθαι, ποιεῖσθαι, υἱοποιεῖσθαι, υἱοθετεῖν) does not appear in the LXX either in the Old Testament literature or in the intertestamental sources.[161] If υἱοθεσία were a mundane way of articulating the status of the Israelites, then the vocabulary of adoption would be expected to appear in at least some of the intertestamental literature. Since the vocabulary of adoption does not appear in any of the other examples, we cannot assume that these texts provide a straightforward link to Paul's use of υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4. Rather, moving forward we must consider how Paul's metaphor interacts with and interprets other "Israelite sonship" metaphors from this tradition.

I have shown that some of the sonship metaphors in both Old Testament and intertestamental texts function as a familial description of YHWH's covenant

---

[160] More will be said about these designations in section 3.3 below.

[161] One could possibly argue that the "concept" of adoption is present even if the vocabulary for adoption is not (e.g. James Scott, *Adoption as Sons*). However, it is equally arguable that those who see the concept present without the vocabulary anachronistically read the concept "adoption" back into the text where it may not have been originally present. As I have argued in my chapters on methodology, the vehicle of a metaphor evokes a specific set of associations, and vehicles are not wholly interchangeable (see section 2.3.1 of chapter 2, and 2.1.1 of chapter 3). Thus, I maintain that the concept of υἱοθεσία cannot be present in these texts without the vehicle υἱοθεσία (or another word from the same semantic domain of adoption) also being present.

relationship with Israel (e.g. Exod 4:22; Jer 31:7-10; Hos 1:6-10; Wis 12:19-22; *3 Macc. 7.6*; *Ps.Sol.* 18:1-4). In most cases YHWH acts on behalf of his sons, disciplining them in order to show them mercy, and bringing them to repentance and restoration (e.g. Deut 8:5; 32:5-6; Isa 30:1-11; Wis 12:19-22; *Ps. Sol.* 18:4), though this action does not preclude the possibility of YHWH turning his back on the Israelites for a time (e.g. Jer 31:7-10; Hos 1:6-2:1 [1:10]). YHWH's actions toward other nations are often punitive, both for the unrighteous behavior of these nations and on occasion, specifically for their treatment of Israel as the chosen son of YHWH (e.g. Wis 12:19-22; see also Wis 18:1-4; Jdt 9:12-14). The designations of "son" and "sons" did not exclude the possibility that there were some among the Israelites who did not receive the blessing of sonship (see esp. *Ps. Sol.* 17.26-29). Furthermore, in texts that designate the collective Israel as "son" it seems that the collective designation does not preclude the possibility that some individuals within the collective will experience judgment, and possibly forfeit the benefit of sonship (e.g. Jer 31:7-10; *Ps.Sol.* 18.1-4; see also *Ps. Sol.* 17.26-29). There is a strong component of nationalism and exclusivity in many of the occurrences of the sonship metaphor, where Israel is set in a dichotomous relationship with other nations (e.g. Deut 32:5-9; Wis 12:19-22; *Jos. Asen.* 19.8; 21.4; *Ps. Sol.* 18.1-4). In light of the analysis above, it seems reasonable to conclude that in most contexts, the designation of "sonship" is an affirmation of Israel's unique identity as the people of YHWH and is closely linked to ethnicity and national identity.

3.3 Paul's "Reflection" of the Sonship Tradition

Having broadly traced the contours of the landscape of texts containing Israelite sonship metaphors I will now consider how Paul's text interacts in intertextual relationships with these precursory texts. Here we must bear in mind that the purpose in surveying the previous texts was not to trace the "sources" of or "influences" on Paul's metaphor but rather to sketch the tradition that Paul draws upon and intentionally "distorts in order to interpret."[162] To use Brawley's terminology, I will show in the analysis below that although Paul's metaphor speaks in harmony with some of the themes found in other sonship metaphors, he reinterprets

[162] John Hollander, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), ix.

and appropriates these themes in important ways to suit his context. The theme may remain, but its transposition into the Pauline text results in marked differences in the meaning of Israelite sonship. Furthermore, because Paul employs an image—υἱοθεσία—which does not occur in other Jewish texts, there are elements of discord that arise when the Pauline image collides with images from precursor texts in the intertextual space.

The intertextual relationship between Romans 9:4 and the other texts we examined is simultaneously diachronic and synchronic. Moreover, the diachronic relationship is bidirectional. Paul has not only incorporated and transposed elements from previous texts in order to create a new figuration in Romans 9, but also his new figuration might cause his readers to reinterpret other texts containing Israelite sonship metaphors retrospectively. This seems to me to be a particularly salient feature of intertextual relationships within Scripture, and indeed a feature that both Old and New Testament authors employ with a good deal of self-awareness and creativity in order to appropriate texts to new situations. I propose that Paul's change in image reverberates powerfully through the intertextual landscape, reinterpreting Israel's sonship through his unique variation on the theme.

It bears repeating that the Pauline image "adoption to sonship (υἱοθεσία)," is a different image than "son (υἱός)," "sons (υἱοί)," and "firstborn (πρωτότοκος)," which we saw in the texts above; these are all certainly related images, but they are not identical. I argued in previous chapters that metaphors are not necessarily interchangeable even when they utilize the same vehicle (e.g. Gal 5:7; 1 Cor 9:24-26, and 2 Thess 3:1 and τρέχω),[163] and Paul's metaphor in Romans 9:4, which uses an entirely different vehicle (υἱοθεσία), produces some elements that are in discord with other expressions of Israelite sonship that we have seen in other texts. However, despite the difference in vocabulary between Romans 9:4 and the other Israelite sonship texts, Paul's metaphor speaks in harmony with several aspects of the other metaphors examined above: (1) as an affirmation of Israel's particularity, (2) as a description of Israel's covenant relationship with YHWH and (3) as a confirmation of God's election of Israel. Paul's metaphor also contributes elements that are unique and novel—elements that speak back to other texts in the tradition and provide a new framework for reading them. First, in Romans 9:4 υἱοθεσία negates any sense of

[163] See section 2.3.1 of chapter 2 for a fuller discussion of a metaphor's vehicle and meaning.

sonship being an *exclusive* privilege of the Israelites. If the Israelites can be adopted, then others (i.e. gentiles) can also receive sonship through adoption, which is not true of other vehicles for sonship, such as πρωτότοκος or μονογενής. Second, despite Paul's affirmation of Israel's covenant relationship, υἱοθεσία provides a noticeably different schema from "firstborn," which appears in several other versions of sonship metaphors (e.g. Exod 4:22; Jer 31:9; Sir 36:16-17; *Pss. Sol.* 18.1-4), but which Paul reserves for Christ alone (Rom 8:29). Third, since the elective component of Israel's sonship is highlighted, υἱοθεσία decisively undercuts any hint of "naturalness" present in passages where terms like πρωτότοκος or μονογενής appear. These unique elements brought by Paul's innovative use of υἱοθεσία work with the recontextualized themes from the other Israelite sonship texts to produce Paul's unique "reflection" of Israelite sonship, and the combination of these elements will be examined in detail below. The complexity of the intertextual relationships evoked by the Pauline metaphor demonstrates Hays' assertion that "texts are not inert; they burn and throw fragments of flame on their rising heat."[164] Below I will show that Paul's choice of υἱοθεσία has several potentially volatile implications both for his text and for the texts he has transposed. In choosing υἱοθεσία Paul becomes an interpreter and innovator of the sonship tradition.

The most obvious parallel between Paul's designation in Romans 9:4 and the Old Testament and intertestamental texts examined above is simply that Paul also counts sonship as a privilege of ethnic Israel.[165] In doing so, he affirms the particularity of YHWH's relationship with the Israel as the original recipients of the privilege of sonship and the other privileges he lists. As Michael Cranford remarks, "If a Jew cannot depend on his or her ethnicity, then what does this say about God's promises to ethnic Israel?"[166] Indeed, it is precisely the particularity of God's promises *to Israel* that causes Paul his anguish (Rom 9:2), and arguably necessitates the whole of Paul's discourse in Romans 9-11.

However, particularity for Paul apparently does not imply the exclusivity that is found in some of the texts examined above. Although Paul must wrestle with how

---

[164] Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 33.
[165] Fitzmyer remarks, "Paul readily makes use of the honorific title 'Israelites' bestowed of old by Yahweh himself….Jews still have…the right to boast of such an ancestral heritage associated with a God-given name" (*Romans*, 545).
[166] Cranford, "Election and Ethnicity," 28.

God's particular relationship with the Israelites fits with the inclusion of the gentiles, it is clear that Paul sees the possibility of Jews and gentiles coexisting as "sons" (e.g. Romans 8:15, 23). Since Paul has already used υἱοθεσία to refer to the adoption to sonship of believers in Christ, be they Jew or Gentile, twice in the previous chapter (8:15, 23),[167] it cannot be an exclusive privilege of the Israelites any longer. Thus when Paul ascribes υἱοθεσία to Israel in Romans 9:4, it sits alongside the υἱοθεσία of believers in Romans 8. It seems then, that despite Paul's affirmation of Israel's particularity through the υἱοθεσία metaphor, the concept of particularity has been reworked in light of Paul's adamant inclusion of the gentiles in God's plan of salvation. As Moo states, "Paul must…demonstrate that the God who chose and made promises to Israel is the same God who has opened the doors of salvation 'to all who believe.'"[168] As a concept, υἱοθεσία is well-suited to the reworking of Israel's particularity; it enables Paul to stress Israel's status as "sons" without employing terms like πρωτότοκος or μονογενής that by nature would exclude others from sharing these labels, or would elevate Israel over the gentiles in the hierarchy of birth order. While Paul can use υἱοθεσία to affirm Israel's particularity as God's covenant people, the repetition of the term, which is also used in 8:15 and 23, in 9:4 alerts the reader that the boundaries of God's covenant people have been extended. Where there can be only one "firstborn" or "only child," (e.g. Exod 4:22; Jer 31:7-10; Sir 36:16-17; *Pss. Sol.* 18:1-4), υἱοθεσία does not preclude the possibility of other sons.

Furthermore, whereas several of the texts which utilize sonship metaphors emphasize the preeminence of Israel in conjunction with the nation's particularity as the "firstborn" of YHWH, Paul's use of υἱοθεσία appears as a term of contrast to the sonship of Christ, whom Paul describes as πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς just a few verses earlier (Rom 8:29). For Paul to label Christ rather than Israel as πρωτότοκος and then to ascribe adoptive sonship to Israel represents a significant deviation from other expressions of the sonship metaphor (e.g. Exod 4:22; Jer 31:9; Wis 18:13; Sir 36:17; 2 Esd 6:58; *Ps. Sol.* 13.9; 18.4). It is not surprising that the

[167] This has led some scholars to conclude that υἱοθεσία in Rom 9:4 is of a fundamentally different character than υἱοθεσία in Rom 8:15, 23 (e.g. Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 2, 461; Moo, *Romans*, 561; Murray, *Romans*, vol. 2, 5). However, I would suggest rather than υἱοθεσία "decreasing" in significance to a kind of "proto-adoption," we, in fact, have Paul reinterpreting the historic designations of Israelite sonship in a way that underscores God's elective purposes and mercy towards Israel by drawing attention to God's divine act of making sons by adoption, which he does for the sake of both Israel and the gentiles who will also receive sonship through adoption.
[168] Moo, *Romans*, 550.

Pauline emphasis is clearly on the preeminence of Christ as firstborn, indeed this designation evokes its own set of intertextual relationships to texts where the Davidic Messiah is designated the "firstborn" (e.g. Ps 89:27). However, in the Old Testament the designation of the Davidide as "firstborn" and Israel as "firstborn" stand side by side. Here in Romans 8–9 Christ stands alone as the "firstborn," confirming his identity as the Messiah of Israel, and Israel's sonship is described using the same term Paul uses of gentiles only a few verses earlier. Paul, in using υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4, affirms the ongoing sonship of Israel while removing the element of preeminence found in other Israelite sonship texts where more exclusionary labels are used.[169] In addition, although most instances of υἱοθεσία would result in a son achieving the status of "firstborn,"[170] Paul's innovative use of the metaphor sets the adoptive sonship of both believers and Israel under the preeminent sonship of the firstborn, Christ.

A second commonality that we see between Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor and some other "Israelite sonship" metaphors is the use of the metaphor to portray aspects of the covenantal relationship between God and his people (e.g. familial intimacy, God's faithfulness, God's discipline, or Israel's disobedience). However, Paul's concept of the covenant relationship expressed in his "Israelite sonship" metaphor, and his subsequent development of "sonship" as a motif, do not have precise parallels to the covenant relationship depicted in any of the texts examined above. Moreover, in combination with its covenantal emphasis, Paul's choice to use υἱοθεσία is uniquely capable of highlighting a third commonality: the *absolute elective nature of sonship* due to God's sovereign choice. While it is true that other iterations of Israelite sonship metaphors strongly emphasize Israel's election,[171] election is inherent in υἱοθεσία in a way that it is not inherent in πρωτότοκος or μονογενής. According to Paul, in God's economy sons are made, not born. Thus by evoking and yet reinterpreting other Israelite sonship metaphors, Paul subtly contrasts the sonship that is achieved by adoption (υἱοθεσία) and the "natural" sonship that is implied in terms

[169] I would argue that Paul's use of υἱοθεσία as the designation of sonship for both Jews and gentiles also strongly suggests that the priority of Israel (e.g. Rom 1:16) in Romans is predominantly a temporal priority rather than a ranking of people groups.
[170] See e.g. the connection between adoption and inheritance discussed in sections 3.2 and 3.3 of chapter 4.
[171] See Grindheim, *The Crux of Election*, 7-76, for an analysis of Jewish understandings of election found in the Old Testament literature and Second Temple Judaism.

like πρωτότοκος or μονογενής. Moreover, that Paul has already designated Jesus as πρωτότοκος further emphasizes that he has conscientiously chosen υἱοθεσία as the designation for Israel's sonship. As Paul's argument in Romans 9 develops, his use of υἱοθεσία as a description of Israel's ongoing covenant relationship with YHWH, and the motif of Israel's sonship, are interwoven with the sonship of the elect among Jews *and gentiles* (e.g. Rom 9:24).[172]

Paul nuances his version of Israel's sonship and covenant relationship primarily through incorporation and reinterpretation of examples from the Old Testament, centering especially on the transformation of the word "son" (e.g. Rom 9:9; Rom 9:24-28). Paul reinterprets "son" primarily through the interplay of changing referents. This is evident first in Paul's analogy between Israel and Abraham (Rom 9:6) where Paul distinguishes between Abraham's children (τέκνα) versus his "seed" (σπέρμα), and culminates in Paul's affirmation that the promise has said "Sarah will have a son (ἔσται τῇ Σάρρᾳ υἱός)" (Rom 9:9). Dunn observes, "Israel's own election was not in terms of natural descent and law, but from the outset and thus characteristically in terms of promise and faith."[173] Thus, Paul brings out what is latent in the text in Genesis, that contrary to normal human experience, sonship of YHWH is granted rather than naturally obtained or inherited. Paul's coupling of the promise and sonship in Romans 9:6-9 further underscores his emphasis on the elective and covenantal nature of Israel's adoptive sonship in Romans 9:4.[174]

Paul develops the elective quality of Israel's sonship further in his example of Jacob and Esau, where Jacob is chosen "so that God's purpose of election might remain (ἵνα ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις τοῦ θεοῦ μένῃ)" (Rom 9:11). Schreiner rightly remarks, "The combination of words underscores in the strongest possible terms that the fulfillment of the promise was based on God's electing purpose and intention."[175]

---

[172] The closest intertextual connection to the Pauline relationship between sonship and election might be *Pss. Sol.* 17 where the "sons" are only the righteous in Israel. See section3.2.3 above for a fuller discussion of this text.

[173] Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 2, 548.

[174] Epp argues that "sonship" is particularly well-suited as a vehicle to link election and covenant. He states, "Paul apparently sought as that rationale the oldest possible basis for continuity….Sonship…was an old link, for it extended back to the very formation and concept of the nation at the time of Jacob" ("Jewish-Gentile Continuity in Paul," 89.

[175] Schreiner, *Romans*, 500. However, Schreiner's insistence that "[Paul's] failure to insert human faith as the decisive and ultimate basis for God's election indicates that God's call and election are prior to and the ground of human faith" (ibid.) inserts the topic of individual faith and response into a

As the argument of Romans 9 unfolds further, it becomes evident that Israel's election to sonship works to uphold God's covenant faithfulness and to show mercy (Rom 9:16).[176]

The elective and covenantal character of υἱοθεσία is then reaffirmed later in the chapter when Paul quotes from Hosea in Romans 9:24-28,[177] wherein both Jews and Gentiles are designated "sons of the living God (υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος)". Though Paul's designation of "sons" is also found in the LXX (ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος) and the MT of Hosea 2:1 (יֵאָמֵר לָהֶם בְּנֵי אֵל־חָי), Paul's use of the quotation in Romans 9:26 substantially changes the sense of the original. Indeed, Moo labels this quotation as "a potentially more serious instance of what seems to be arbitrary hermeneutics on Paul's part."[178] The original setting of the quotation clearly designates the people of Israel as the referent for both "not my people" and "sons of the living God," pointing to their anticipated restoration following the judgment Hosea has prophesied (Hos 1:2-11; 2:21-23). However, Moo's conclusion that "this text reflects a hermeneutical supposition…that OT predictions of a renewed Israel find their fulfillment in the church" might miss the point of Paul's subtle redefinition of sonship. Rather than introducing a "church/Israel" dichotomy into the text, Paul's main point is about *sonship itself*—namely, that sonship is extended through election to both Jews and gentiles to show God's mercy.[179] Similarly, Wagner argues that in Romans 9:24-28,

---

discussion of God's promises to corporate Israel where such an insertion is unwarranted (see also *Idem*., "Does Romans 9 Teach Individual Election unto Salvation? Some Exegetical and Theological Reflections," *JETS* 36 (1993): 25-40; *Idem.,* "Corporate and Individual Election in Romans 9: A Response to Brian Abasciano," *JETS* 49 (2006): 373-86). Abasciano's critique of Schreiner is apt: "I would like to register my skepticism concerning the claim that Rom 9:11-12, 16 imply that faith is a predestined result of election….Moreover, what is true of the elect people as a whole does not apply equally and directly to individuals on their own, but…to individuals as members of the group" (Brian Abasciano, "Corporate Election in Romans 9: A Reply to Tom Schreiner," *JETS* 49 (2006): 363-64. See also N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992), 238-39.

[176] Abasciano observes, "Romans 9:11-12 does not actually seek to make a point about election *per se,* but uses the example of God's election of Jacob…to make a statement about God's *purpose* in election" ("Corporate Election in Romans 9," 363 [emph. orig.]).

[177] Paul's quotation of Hosea in verse 25 does not precisely match any known manuscript of the text. It is likely that Paul changes ἐλεήσω (LXX) to καλέσω to maintain his theme of "calling," but it is unclear what motivated him to abandon Hosea's text (τὴν οὐκ ἠλεημένην) and reverse the order of the clauses. Dunn argues that Paul added καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην "[i]n view of the prominence of ἀγαπᾶν in Hosea…and he may even have intended it to sum up the whole message of Hosea" (*Romans*, vol. 2, 571).

[178] Moo, *Romans*, 613.

[179] On the theme of mercy binding together the whole of Romans 9-11 see Michael Theobald, "Unterschiedliche Gottesbilder in Röm 9-11? Die Israel-Kapitel als Anfrage an die Einheit des

> [T]he apostle begins to write these Gentiles into Israel's own story. Reviewing the Scriptures through the lens of his gospel and mission, he audaciously appropriates for the Gentiles an oracle of the prophet Hosea that originally envisioned the redemption of Israel.[180]

Thus Paul's use of the sonship motif in Hosea 2:1 (1:10) at once affirms that sonship is an expression of a covenant relationship with the Living God (either for Israelites [e.g. Rom 9:4] or for Jews and Gentiles [e.g. Rom 9:24]), and also that this covenant relationship, while being the privilege of the Israelites, is no longer restricted to Israel.[181] The covenantal nature of sonship remains, the promise to Israel remains, but the exclusivity of Israel's sonship is emptied from the original settings of the texts as Paul's argument unfolds through chapter 9.[182]

Paul's innovative use of Hosea 2:1 (1:10) is particularly interesting when it is set alongside his use of Isaiah 10:22 in Romans 9:27-28. In Isaiah 10:22 the Israelites are referred to as "your people" in the text of the MT (עַמְּךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל) and simply as "the people" in the LXX (ὁ λαὸς Ισραηλ). Paul's version, "the sons of Israel" (τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ), either quotes from a tradition that contained "sons" rather than "people," or Paul changed the attested tradition and emended the text himself. [183] In any case, Paul presumably chooses to include "sons" rather than "people" in his version of the text of Isaiah.[184] This emendation to Isaiah suggests that his development of the sonship motif, beginning with υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4 and continuing throughout the chapter, is both intentional and strategic, as Paul re-inscribes and repurposes Old Testament texts to expand the boundaries of sonship of YHWH. In Romans 9:27-28 the referent for "sons" is the remnant God preserved among the Israelites, and Paul praises God

---

theologischen Diskurses bei Paulus," in *The Letter to the Romans*, ed. Udo Schnelle (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 176-77.

[180] J. Ross Wagner, "Not from the Jews Only, But Also from the Gentiles: Mercy to the Nations in Romans 9-11," in *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 422.

[181] Dunn remarks, "The privilege of sonship with which Israel had been favored (vv 4, 8) has been extended to all who respond to God's call now through the gospel" (*Romans*, vol. 2, 575).

[182] More will be said about Paul's reinterpretation of exclusivity in the discussion below on metaphor and perception (see section 4.1 of this chapter).

[183] Paul's text is more likely an amalgamation of Hos 2:1 and Isa 10:22-23. See Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 2, 572-73; Jewett, *Romans*, 601-603, for a detailed comparative analysis of these texts.

[184] I prefer to think that Paul has intentionally included "sons" as a positive link both to the immediate context of his quotation of Hosea (so Jewett, *Romans*, 602) and also to his development of the sonship motif throughout Romans 9, rather than to think that Paul's change was motivated by his reluctance to quote the original wording from Isaiah (עַמְּךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל) because it would have contradicted his claim in 9:25 (so Dietrich-Alex Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (BHT 69, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986), 168.

through the words of Isaiah for the preservation of the remnant from Israel.[185] As Nils Dahl remarks, "The remnant that remains proves to Paul that God has not rejected his people and that his word stands firm."[186] In Paul, the remnant reinforces that sonship is based solely on the mercy and grace of God, and "in this remnant Paul sees the promises of God carried forward and extended to the eschatological Israel."[187] Thus we see that in the course of Paul's argument, all of God's sons, whether Jew or Gentile, receive the privilege because of God's election. When coupled with his use of Hosea 2:1, Paul's use of Isaiah 10:22 further highlights the elective and covenantal nature of the Pauline concept of sonship.

One final observation regarding Paul's unique "reflection" of Israelite sonship is that his terminology in Romans 9:4 entirely removes the "naturalness" normally associated with sonship from consideration. Both πρωτότοκος and μονογενής suggest, and in cases of metaphorical predication, draw upon "natural" or biological lineage where they are unqualified by a vocabulary of adoption (e.g. Exod 4:22; *Ps.Sol.* 18.4-5). While it is by no means the case that all Jews thought of Israel as the "natural" son of YHWH, it will not do to label a metaphorical predication of πρωτότοκος or μονογενής an instance of "adoption" as a literal paraphrase.[188] Indeed, labeling texts where πρωτότοκος or μονογενής occur as the "adoption" of Israel only muddies the waters for analyzing Paul's metaphor of adoption in Romans 9:4, which uses decidedly different vocabulary. Rather, Paul's choice to use υἱοθεσία to describe Israel's sonship provided him with a much straighter path to affirming the sonship of those beyond the ethnic community of the Israelites than terms like πρωτότοκος or μονογενής, which do not lend themselves to such an affordance. Moreover, with any element of "naturalness" excluded from consideration, God's sovereign choice and plan of election comes to the fore. Paul's argument seems to be that if sonship is entirely elective, then it cannot also be the exclusive privilege of one ethnic group, as God elects from both Jew and Gentile (e.g. Rom 9:24; 11:28-32). The emphasis υἱοθεσία places on election provides Paul with an ideal platform to develop his

---

[185] For an analysis of who exactly constitutes the remnant vis-à-vis Rom 9:6 see Longenecker, "Different Answers to Different Issues," 96-107; Eastman, "Israel and the Mercy of God," 383-85; Jüncker, "Children of Promise," 148-60.
[186] Nils Dahl, *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1977), 149.
[187] Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 574.
[188] For more on the problem of mixed metaphors see section 2.3.5 of chapter 2.

argument that "it is not as though the word of God has failed," which unfolds throughout the course of Romans 9-11.

When we look closely at Paul's use of υἱοθεσία and his development of the sonship motif throughout Romans 9 we must recognize that in some regards it sings in harmony with other similar metaphors in the Old Testament and intertestamental literature, but it does not sing in unison. Indeed there is some internal instability to the development of the motif in the course of Paul's argument, as the referent for "sons" and "children" changes a number of times.[189] However, for Paul, "adoption to sonship" (υἱοθεσία) is esteemed as a privilege of ethnic Israelites (9:4), it is an expression of God's covenant relationship with his people (who are no longer exclusively Israelites [9:25-28]), and this covenant relationship is maintained by God's elective purposes in order for God to show mercy (9:11-18). Furthermore, Paul does not seem to see a conflict between his designation of υἱοθεσία as a privilege to the Israelites and only a remnant of Israel receiving the benefit of sonship (9:27).[190] Indeed for Paul, the preservation of a remnant is evidence that God has not rejected his people (9:27-29; 11:1-6; 28-29), despite the fact that not all of the Israelites enjoy the benefits of sonship (11:7).

When the Pauline metaphor of υἱοθεσία is alongside other metaphors in the sonship tradition, from the more generic υἱοί θεοῦ to more specific terms like πρωτότοκος or μονογενής, then the range of diverse implications each metaphor has the potential to produce becomes more visible. Moreover, interpreters of the Pauline metaphor must recognize that Paul uses υἱοθεσία in a unique and innovative way, and by doing so he cuts against the grain of the sonship tradition which itself had a well-established and recognizable vocabulary of terms used in its other iterations. It is not, then, enough to treat other texts in the sonship tradition as "the background" for the Pauline metaphor. Interpreters must also consider how Paul's language of υἱοθεσία speaks back to these texts, acting as his "reflection" that provides his set of constraints on the character and nature of Israel's sonship. In its "reflecting" role,

---

[189] In 9:4 υἱοθεσία refers to ethnic Israelites; in 9:7-9 Paul introduces a distinction between τέκνα and σπέρμα with only the children of the promise counted as descendants; in 9:26 the gentiles are clearly the referent of "sons of the living God," but in 9:27 "son" is once again used in reference to the ethnic Israelites.

[190] This idea is also present in *Pss. Sol.* 17, and one could argue that it is present in Jer 31:7-10, but see Heaton, "The Root שאר and the Doctrine of the Remnant," 29, for the compelling case that the Pauline concept of a remnant deviates significantly from its Old Testament origins.

υἱοθεσία constrains and reinterprets other texts in the sonship tradition to emphasize YHWH's election of Israel and the gracious nature of Israel's sonship. Paul provides a distinct view of Israel's sonship that maintains the emphasis on God's particular covenantal relationship with Israel while simultaneously extending the possibility of sonship to gentiles. Paul's "reflection" of υἱοθεσία, by emphasizing the election of God rather than the preeminence of Israel, lends itself easily to God's election of non-Israelite sons that is visible later in Paul's argument (Rom 9:24-26).

4. Metaphor and Audience

The previous two sections have examined and identified the features of Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4 that pertain to texts and connections between texts. This final section will move beyond the confines of the text and undertake an examination of the cognitive and affective potential of Paul's metaphor in its setting in Romans 9:4. Here I will examine the potential "intercourse of thoughts" Paul's audience members might experience when they encounter his description of Israel as sons by adoption. It is important to acknowledge that the analysis below necessarily deals in potentialities rather than absolutes, particularly in this case since Paul does not elaborate in detail about the significance he intends by designating υἱοθεσία as a privilege to Israel. The lack of explanation leaves a much wider cognitive gap for his audience members to fill than in occurrences of the υἱοθεσία metaphors where Paul has chosen to elaborate in greater detail on the metaphors' significance.[191]

However, recognizing that one can only propose *a possible understanding* (or understandings) of the metaphor's cognitive and affective properties does not mean that there is not tremendous benefit here in considering the possibilities. If we grant, as I argued in chapter three, that metaphors are inherently performative utterances and that they actively create a framework of perception for their hearers, then any exegesis of metaphor *must seek to elucidate and outline this framework*. This is true even if the precise framework cannot be absolutely delineated for every hearer of Paul's metaphor. In regard to the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4, it is particularly important to bear in mind Turner's argument that "[h]uman language relies on

[191] Of this phenomenon Black reasons, "The extended meanings that result, the relations between initially disparate realms created, can neither be antecedently predicted nor subsequently paraphrased in prose. We can comment *upon* the metaphor, but the metaphor itself neither needs nor invites explanation and paraphrase" (*Models and Metaphors*, 236-37).

common mental systems shared by members of a linguistic community. It relies on shared basic metaphors, idealized cognitive models, and metaphoric inferences."[192] According to Turner, members of a linguistic community (in our case, Paul's audience) are likely to share similar cognitive frameworks because they are likely to respond to Paul's metaphor in similar ways. Thus in the following analysis I will base my construction of the cognitive framework on elements that will be shown to be part of the audience's "common ground."[193]

4.1. Metaphor and Perception

Recall that metaphors primarily influence the perception of their hearers/readers by providing a cognitive structure through which hearers perceive the metaphor's subject (tenor) and also by highlighting and hiding certain features of the tenor.[194] I have already noted that Paul's use of υἱοθεσία as a metaphorical description of God's relationship with Israel is unparalleled by any other source in Jewish literature, making it particularly important to consider the potential framework of perception it created for Paul's audience and what aspects of Israel's relationship with God are highlighted and hidden in Paul's metaphorical description of υἱοθεσία. As I have argued previously, metaphors are not neutral conduits of information, but rather they are active agents in structuring the cognitive framework of their hearers.[195] In this context, Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor provides his hearers with a particular way of thinking about Israel's relationship with God, and it is important to recognize that this framework is not *the only framework* for understanding their relationship.[196] Indeed, Paul uses numerous metaphorical descriptions of Israel during the course of Romans 9-11,[197] each providing its own cognitive framework for the audience. Thus, if we can recognize from the outset that Paul's metaphor is not merely a description, but rather an *active agent* that structures the cognitive framework, then we can also better appreciate its distinctive elements.

---

[192] Turner, *Death is the Mother of Beauty*, 114.
[193] Herbert Clark, *Using Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 100-112.
[194] Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 139; Morgan, *Images of Organizations*, 4.
[195] For a full discussion of this supposition see section 2.1 of chapter 3.
[196] See Zhang, "Corporate Identity Metaphor," 375-94, for excellent analysis and illustration of the constitutive power of metaphor.
[197] E.g. see P. J. Maartens, "Inference and Relevance in Paul's Allegory of the Wild Olive Tree," *HvTSt* 53.4 (1997): 1000-1029.

4.1.1. Outlining the Cognitive Framework of Israel's Adoption to Sonship

Delineating the cognitive framework Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor provides in Romans 9:4 is perhaps the most straightforward component of our current task. The cognitive structure the metaphor creates is closely related to the metaphor's tenor, which in this case is Israel's relationship with God, and its vehicle, which in this case is υἱοθεσία.[198] These two elements in the text lead to the "intercourse of thoughts," which evokes the cognitive structure of υἱοθεσία through which Paul's audience perceives Israel's relationship to YHWH in Romans 9:4. As described earlier in the discussion of the metaphor's possible underlying models, υἱοθεσία always denotes "adoption," which means that the cognitive framework through which Paul's audience views Israel's relationship with God here is "adopted sonship."[199] This cognitive framework creates several key perceptions for Paul's hearers that will be integral to his argument as it unfolds in Romans 9-11: (1) υἱοθεσία as a cognitive framework establishes Israel's filial relationship with YHWH and (2) υἱοθεσία creates the nuance "adoption" within the framework of "sonship" that allows Paul to emphasize God's sovereign choice of Israel as the covenant people.

For those who would here object that Paul was drawing upon the well-worn framework of Israel as the son of YHWH rather than coining a new image,[200] it is necessary to further explain what I mean by υἱοθεσία establishing a framework of filial relationship with God in Romans 9:4. We have already seen that the intertextual relationships evoked by the Pauline metaphor in Romans 9:4 are comprised of the interaction between the Pauline image, υἱοθεσία, and terms such as υἱός/υἱοί, πρωτότοκος, and μονογενής which appear in other texts. Through his use of υἱοθεσία as a vehicle for his metaphor in Romans 9:4, Paul is able to draw upon and reinterpret the image of Israel as the son of YHWH that is found in other texts, which lies dormant in the minds of his hearers until Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor conjures it into action.

It is here that understanding the dynamic component of intertextual relationships becomes essential to our task of reconstructing the cognitive framework

---

[198] For a thorough explanation of the tenor and vehicle in Romans 9:4 see section 2.2 above.
[199] Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 55-60; *pace* Byrne who argues that adoption "is the terminology traditionally used in the Jewish tradition to express the titles and privileges of Israel" (*"Sons of God,"* 128).
[200] See especially Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 1-8; Jewett, *Romans*, 563.

created by Paul's metaphor. Although there are other images associated with the sonship of Israel found in other texts, prior to Paul's metaphorical statement "to whom belongs the adoption" (ὧν ἡ υἱοθεσία), Paul's audience members would have had no compelling reason to be contemplating Israel's relationship with God through the specific cognitive framework of υἱοθεσία. It is only once Paul has introduced the metaphor of υἱοθεσία to his list of the privileges of Israel that his audience members possess the cognitive structure elicited by the metaphor. This is particularly true since Paul's use of υἱοθεσία as a description of Israel's relationship with God is unprecedented.[201] Furthermore, though it is easy for contemporary interpreters, who often have the text laid out before them for careful study, to forget to consider the drama of hearing the text read aloud in real time, we must recognize that Paul's use of υἱοθεσία would not have been anticipated and might well have been a shocking statement for some among his audience. Thus for Paul's audience, and in real time as his letter is being read, it is *his use of υἱοθεσία* that likely established their perception of Israel as the son of God through adoption. For those who see the "concept" of adoption in Israel's history,[202] Paul's use of υἱοθεσία brings clarity to the concept by naming it, and organizes those texts into the particular framework of adoption. J. David Cisneros argues, "Metaphors create conventional understandings by connecting phenomena with familiar cultural assumptions and experiences. Not only are they essential cognitive tools, but metaphors participate in creating fundamental understandings of texts."[203] If Cisneros is correct,[204] then the framework "Israel as adopted son" is created by connecting the cultural phenomena found in other texts, and in the folk memory of Israel's history to Paul's framework of υἱοθεσία. Moreover, once Paul has enlisted the particular cognitive structure of υἱοθεσία, his continued use of the motif of sonship ensures that the framework of υἱοθεσία and the entailments of the metaphor are sustained throughout the rest of Romans 9.

---

[201] Jewett wrongly concludes that reducing υἱοθεσία to adoption weakens the continuity between the Jewish people and the Gentiles, preferring instead to view υἱοθεσία as "sonship" (*Romans*, 563). However, if we take Paul's choice of υἱοθεσία to be a strategic way of reinterpreting the historical designation of Israel's sonship, then there is still continuity to sonship between the Jewish people and gentiles because all sonship of YHWH occurs through adoption. In addition, Scott's lexical analysis shows the translation "sonship" to be wanting (*Adoption as Sons*, 55-57). See also Kunst, *Römische Adoption*, for the diversity of expressions and adoption formulae in the Roman world.

[202] E.g. Jewett, *Romans*, 563; Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 2, 533.

[203] Cisneros, "Contaminated Communities," 570.

[204] See also Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 62-63.

Though his specification of adoption might have produced a number of accompanying connotations, as I noted in the discussion above, several implications specific to "adoptive sonship" are the most obvious. First, Paul's designation of "adoptive sonship" provides a structure of kinship that is "by decree" rather than "by nature." James Dunn alludes to the change in cognitive framework created by υἱοθεσία where he states, "the form, denoting adoptive rather than natural sonship, helps bring out the sense of election more clearly."[205] In the cognitive framework of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphor the filial relationship between God and Israel is created by God's decree and designation of Israel as "son," clearly elucidating the connection between sonship and election. Furthermore, it is striking that the cognitive structure Paul evokes by using the same vehicle for Israel's sonship is the same as that of believers' sonship in Romans 8:15 and 8:23, which was likely recollected by his audience members as Romans 9:4 was read.[206] The framework of υἱοθεσία which Paul evokes in Romans 9:4 is one where Israel's sonship is created by God's initiative and sovereign choice to make Israel his adopted son. It is important to note that in describing Israel as an adopted son, Paul couples a familial, relational, and personal framework with the sovereign choice of God. Thus God's "election," which will become an increasingly important concept in the course of Romans 9-11, begins first in the filial concept in υἱοθεσία.[207]

4.1.2. Israel's Adoption: Highlighting and Hiding Features of Sonship

In considering the structure which the υἱοθεσία metaphor provides for Paul's description of Israel's sonship in Romans 9:4, we must also consider what elements of Israel's relationship with God are highlighted and which are hidden by the metaphor's particular structure. Perhaps Paul's most obvious achievement in ascribing υἱοθεσία to Israel is to highlight for his audience that *Israel continues to have a filial relationship with God*. As Jewett asserts, "[W]hen Paul employs the present tense

---

[205] Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 2, 526.

[206] Though commentators who see a distinction between the adoption of believers in Romans 8 and Israel's adoption in Romans 9 rightly grasp the change in context for the metaphor (e.g. Moo, *Romans*, 562; Murray, *Romans*, vol. 2, 5; Cranfield, *Romans*, vol 2., 461; Barrett, *Romans*, 177), it seems that drawing too sharp a distinction between the occurrences misses the continuity that Paul is attempting to establish between Israel and the Gentiles as the people of the covenant (see also Epp, "Jewish-Gentile Continuity in Paul," 82).

[207] Jüncker aptly states, "*The intractable problem of election cannot finally be resolved without reference to spiritual paternity*" ("Children of Promise," 146 [emph. orig.]).

verb, 'who *are* Israelites,' … he reinforces the abiding validity of their place as the people of God."[208] This was by no means obvious for all of Paul's audience members, and indeed the particulars of the fate of Israel are the subject of Paul's extended discourse in Roman 9-11 (esp. 11:17-24).[209] In using υἱοθεσία at the outset of his discussion of the place of Israel, Paul has highlighted not only the covenantal, but the *familial* relationship which forms the basis of God's ongoing care for the Israelites as his sons. Whatever wrestling Paul or his audience members do with the ongoing status of the Israelites, Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor ensures it is done through the lens of the Israelites as *sons*.

In addition to highlighting and emphasizing that the Israelites continue to possess and enjoy a familial relationship with God,[210] Paul's unique use of υἱοθεσία to describe the filial relationship highlights several aspects of the sonship of the Israelites. First, as noted above, in using υἱοθεσία Paul highlights God's divine act of election, of choosing the Israelites as his covenant people and bestowing sonship upon them. Υἱοθεσία as a framework undergirds that, as Stuhlmacher succinctly states: "He is the one to whom Israel owes all her privileges!"[211] Moreover, the element of decree is distinctive to υἱοθεσία as a process of kinship formation, and thus is likely the component of Israel's sonship that the υἱοθεσία metaphor strongly emphasizes. Therefore, describing Israel's sonship also highlights a particular aspect of God's character as the God who graciously elects and extends kinship to his covenant people.[212] Describing the Israelites as adoptive sons of God allows Paul to begin his discourse by emphasizing both God's relational attributes as Father and his divine initiative to extend sonship to the Israelites. Furthermore, the metaphor highlights the continued obligations the Israelites have as sons of the adopted Father. Based on the connection between sonship and obedience found in many of the Old Testament and intertestamental texts examined earlier, it is also possible that the

---

[208] Jewett, *Romans*, 562.
[209] So Dunn, "The theme is Israel's destiny, not the doctrine of justification illustrated by Israel," *Romans*, vol. 2, 520.
[210] *Pace* Reinhard Feldmeier who argues that the image of God as Father in Romans 1-8 is in tension with Paul's portrayal of God as the potter in Romans 9-11 ("Vater und Töpfer: Zur Identität Gottes in Römerbrief," in *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010], 377-390.
[211] Stuhlmacher, *Paul's Letter to the Romans*, 146.
[212] See Lloyd Gaston, *Paul and the Torah* (Vancouver: University of British Colombia Press, 1987), 93-97; Longenecker, "Different Answers to Different Issues," 106; Cranford, "Election and Ethnicity," 31-32; Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 2, 518-21, 538-69.

failure of some Israelites to meet these covenant obligations constitutes a break in covenant, and an act of disobedience and defiance by God's sons.[213] Only υἱοθεσία as a metaphor is able to highlight these attributes simultaneously, making the metaphor an ideally suited starting place for Paul's argument that follows.

The cognitive structure created by Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor also limits the possible perception of his audience members toward Israel. As explained in previous chapters, metaphors are often most persuasive because of what they prohibit their audience from seeing, rather than solely because of what they bring more clearly into view.[214] Such is the case in Paul's use of υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4, which seems to deliberately hide ingrained elements of kinship relationships that are found in most other filial metaphors (e.g. Exod 4:22 and πρωτότοκος); most significantly, the cognitive framework created by υἱοθεσία likely prohibits the audience from entertaining notions of "naturalness" that are embedded in most other filial metaphors. Thus the audience from the outset views Israel's sonship not as something they possess as an inherent right, but as a status bestowed by divine decree.[215]

To some degree, the suppression of notions of natural descent in Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor disguises and tones down some of the obvious difficulties Israel's particularity as God's covenant people creates in light of their rejection of the gospel (9:2; 9:31-33; 11:1-12). At the very least, the metaphor provides Paul with a starting point that is more conducive to his defense of election in Romans 9:6-18 than other terms he might have used for Israel's sonship. For Paul, "The story of Israel is the story of God's election and salvation."[216] His shrewd use of υἱοθεσία as a description prepares his audience for his insistence that Israel's particularity is not their "natural

---

[213] Scholars take note that Paul highlights Israel's disobedience in Romans 9-11 (e.g. Glenn N. Davies, *Faith and Obedience in Romans* [JSNTSup 39, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990], 176; Cranford, "Election and Ethnicity," 31; Longenecker, "Different Answers to Different Issues," 102-103; Henry Thiessen, "The Place of Israel in the Scheme of Redemption: As Set Forth in Romans 9-11," *BSac* 98 [1941]: 91). Thiessen comes the closest to identifying Israel's disobedience with sonship, listing Deuteronomy 32 and Isaiah 65 as evidence that "Israel should have known from their own Scripture that the Gentiles would come in and they would be set aside" ("The Place of Israel," 91). However, Thiessen overlooks both the ongoing sonship of Israel in Romans 9-11 and the faithfulness of God to his covenant people as his sons in the very texts he cites.

[214] See especially the discussion in section 2.1.2 of chapter 3; see also Lakoff and Turner, *More than Cool Reason*, 39-44.

[215] See Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 2, 547; *Pace* Jewett, who argues that υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4 emphasizes Gentile inclusion ("believers who do not have Jewish blood") into ethnic Israel, who inherit sonship naturally (*Romans*, 563).

[216] Mary Ann Getty, "Paul on the Covenants and the Future of Israel," *BTB* 17 (1987): 95.

right" but rather is theirs by God's gracious election.[217] If their particularity rests not on their inherited ethnicity but on God's gracious election (e.g. Rom 9:6-8), then Paul is able to make the bold leap from affirming God's allegiance to the Jews to developing his argument that "God's election of Israel is fundamentally the paradigm for God's election of all humanity."[218] If the Israelites are not "natural sons" but rather are sons by God's adoptive decree, then it also follows that the υἱοθεσία metaphor effectively hides the distinction between Jew and Gentile. As Longenecker remarks, "the door into the community of God's people is opened to those who fall outside the ethnic boundary of Israel."[219] Both Jew and Gentile have received sonship via adoption, both are part of God's elective plan, and both can exist as part of God's covenant people. While the concept of υἱοθεσία would not have removed the ethnic distinctions of Jew and Gentile, the metaphor does subordinate these distinctions to the unification of Jew and Gentile before God the Father as equal sons by adoption.

4.2 Metaphor and Emotion in Romans 9:4

Delineated in previous chapters, the attendant emotions that accompany a metaphorical utterance are often a large component in the overall persuasive capacity of the metaphor.[220] A metaphor's work in changing the audience's perception of its subject by implementing a particular cognitive structure is but the preliminary step to changing how the audience *feels* about the particular subject. Indeed, I have argued that the success of a metaphor often depends on its ability to persuade its hearers/readers to feel a certain way about its subject, and that to understand a metaphor means to experience the emotions it evokes. How does υἱοθεσία as a metaphorical framework influence how Paul's audience *feels* about the Israelites? What emotions are likely to be evoked if Paul's metaphor is successful in changing the perception of his audience members? Furthermore, Booth's assertion that persuasive metaphorical utterances invite the audience members to construct a narrative in which they participate must also be considered for Paul's υἱοθεσία

[217] I do not necessarily mean to imply that other Jewish writings assume that election *is* their natural right, but just to point out that υἱοθεσία leaves no room for doubt about where Paul stands on the matter.
[218] J. Louis Martyn, "Paul and His Jewish-Christian Interpreters," *USQR* 42 (1988): 9.
[219] Longenecker, "Different Answers to Different Issues," 113.
[220] See section 2.2 of chapter 3; see also Cohen, *Thinking of Others*, 22-24.

metaphor in Romans 9:4,[221] despite the fact that it occurs in a list rather than in an overtly narrative context.

Before examining the emotional effects of Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor we must first gauge Paul's general tone of the frame in which the metaphor is placed and discern whether there is an underlying or implicit narrative structure in Romans 9:1-5. If the metaphor were found in a context that did not contain highly emotive content, then perhaps the exercise in identifying the emotional content of the metaphor would be far more speculative, since the surrounding text would do little to suggest appropriate attendant feelings to the audience. However, this is definitively not the case in the text of Romans 9:1-5. Indeed, in these opening verses of chapter 9 Paul uses some of the most emotionally charged language that occurs in his letter to the Romans.[222] Indeed, several of Kövecses' conceptual metaphors of emotion are identifiable in Paul's opening statements in verses 1-3. The presence of this emotionally charged language suggests that there is a clear path Paul wishes his audience members to follow in terms of cultivating a particular emotional response from them.

After a paean of praise for God at the end of chapter 8, Paul begins a new section of his argument in chapter 9 with a highly emotional lament over the current state of the Israelites. I have already noted the lack of transition that likely indicates Paul intended the opening verses of chapter 9 to be read at a slow and solemn pace. He then continues his lament by declaring "I have great sorrow and unceasing anguish in my heart" (λύπη μοί ἐστιν μεγάλη καὶ ἀδιάλειπτος ὀδύνη τῇ καρδίᾳ μου). As I noted in chapters five and six, Paul's location of emotion in the heart draws upon the conceptual metaphor "IMPORTANT IS CENTRAL." That Paul locates sadness within his heart indicates that the seat of his will and affections has been consumed by feelings of grief for his fellow Israelites, and indicates the importance of the "Israel question" for Paul. Moreover, sadness is conceptualized in two powerful ways in Paul's statement "I have great sorrow and unceasing anguish in my heart" (λύπη μοί ἐστιν μεγάλη καὶ ἀδιάλειπτος ὀδύνη τῇ καρδίᾳ μου). Like many other emotions, sadness can be conceptualized as fluid in a container,[223] which is likely the best

[221] Booth, *The Company We Keep*, 293-320.
[222] See Jewett, *Romans*, 556; Johann D. Kim, *God, Israel, and the Gentiles: Rhetoric and Situation in Romans 9-11* (SBLDS 176, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2000), 122.
[223] Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion*, 25-26.

candidate for λύπη...μεγάλη. Conceptualized this way, sadness is presented as a liquid that overwhelms and overflows from Paul's heart in response to the fate of his kindred. Coupled with the portrayal of sadness as a fluid in a container, ἀδιάλειπτος ὀδύνη perhaps indicates the underlying conceptual metaphor "SADNESS IS AN OPPONENT."[224] Paul's use of ἀδιάλειπτος depicts sadness relentlessly beating against Paul the same way YHWH or adversaries are depicted as dispensing unyielding blows against the Israelites (e.g. Isa 14:6; *4 Macc.* 10.11). In addition, ὀδύνη can be used both of emotional or physical sicknesses or maladies, suggesting that sadness here is also conceptualized as an illness or a wound.[225] Conceptualized as a fluid, opponent, and illness, Paul's sadness in the opening verses sets a dire tone for the opening verses of chapter 9 and moves his audience to appreciate the importance and solemnity of Paul's argument in the coming chapters.

After setting the tone for his subsequent argument in verses 1-2, in verse 3 Paul goes even further in his desperation and says "For I wish that I myself would be an anathema to Christ on behalf of my brothers and sisters, my kinsfolk according to the flesh" (ηὐχόμην γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα). There is no doubt that terms like "great sorrow," "unceasing anguish," and a wish to be "anathema" represent Paul's strong emotions over the state of the Israelites, but these statements also were likely to evoke a similar set of feelings for Paul's audience members because of the "sameness of vision" Paul has cultivated throughout the previous chapters of the letter. If this is the case, then Paul's audience would encounter his list of privileges in 9:4 with similar attendant feelings of sorrow and anguish for ethnic Israel. Moreover, although Paul does not explicitly set his statements in 9:1-5 within a narrative context, their content likely evokes the broad narrative of Israel's history. Paul's language of anguish reminds the audience of Israel's historic status as God's people, and the list of privileges traces in broad contours God's historic dealings with them. Moreover, Paul's use of υἱοθεσία at the outset of the list sets the whole narrative of God's covenant dealings with Israel within a filial framework and narrative. Furthermore, Paul's narration of Israel's history presents an unresolved conflict: his kinsmen have largely failed to embrace Jesus as Messiah.

---

[224] Ibid., 25.
[225] *TDNT*, vol. 5, 115; Kövecses, 25.

By inviting his audience to participate in this narrative world, Paul invites them also to experience and empathize with his emotions over his kinsmen. Elliott argues that Paul's words deeply influence his primarily Gentile audience, moving them "to share his profound and anxious compassion *for the Jews* who have not yet embraced the fulfillment of what is properly *their* destiny."[226] When they are presented with Paul's metaphor "they are Israelites, to whom belongs the adoption to sonship" (οἵτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται, ὧν ἡ υἱοθεσία), the audience is encouraged to recognize that these feelings of sorrow and anguish are directed toward a group who has received the same designation—υἱοθεσία—that they have themselves received just a few paragraphs earlier. Their shared metaphorical designation produces an even more pronounced emotional response from Paul's audience because they are able to lament from a place of personal identification. Indeed, although some contemporary interpreters are eager to point out the differences between Israel's adoption and the adoption of believers in 8:15 and 8:23, it is precisely the symmetry of the metaphorical designations that makes Paul's introduction to his exposition on Israel so compelling.

Furthermore, in addition to Paul setting the stage with a highly emotive vocabulary that likely initiated similar feelings in his audience members, the υἱοθεσία metaphor potentially evokes a unique set of emotional responses from Paul's audience in and of itself. Because Paul does not elaborate on the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4, identifying precisely what conceptual metaphors of emotion it evoked within each member of Paul's audience is impossible. The models underlying the metaphor might have created for the audience members here, in the midst of Paul's lament, a general sense of confidence in God's promises to the Israelites, as υἱοθεσία likely evokes an image of a permanent and enduring bestowal of sonship.[227] Moreover, for those who were familiar with other expressions of sonship for Israel, the υἱοθεσία metaphor likely created an assurance of God's particular concern for the Israelites, while also communicating that this concern rests solely on the prerogative of God's choice of Israel to be his adopted sons. As Beker aptly remarks, "[T]he

[226] Elliott, *The Rhetoric of Romans*, 123 (emph. orig.).
[227] See Beker, "The Faithfulness of God," 16; Dunn, "Did Paul Have a Covenant Theology?," 16.

argument of Romans is held together by the theme of the peculiar interaction between Israel's particularity and the universality of the gospel for the Gentiles."[228]

To those who were sympathetic to Paul's insistence that God's word had not failed for the Israelites, the metaphor of υἱοθεσία likely confirmed their deeply rooted belief that God would be faithful to the people whom he had chosen to be his sons. The emphasis υἱοθεσία places on God's sovereign choice likely created a glimmer of assurance at the outset that, although the present situation for the Israelites seemed dire, God had chosen the Israelites and would act graciously toward his sons. As Paul himself says later, "the gifts and the calling of God are irrevocable (ἀμεταμέλητα γὰρ τὰ χαρίσματα καὶ ἡ κλῆσις τοῦ θεοῦ.)" (Rom 11:29). For those among Paul's audience who were less sympathetic to his stance toward ethnic Israel, it is possible that Paul's emotive vocabulary leading up to the υἱοθεσία metaphor, and the *pathos* associated with the metaphor itself, moved their emotions and caused them to identify more closely with the plight of the Israelites.

4.3 Metaphor and Community

Though it is hopefully apparent by this point that Paul's use of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4 likely had a considerable effect on the audience's perception of Israel, and perhaps even the emotions that might have accompanied their viewing Israel through the cognitive framework of adoption, the ramifications of this perception on the creation of intimacy and the identity of the community of Paul's audience remains to be examined. If Paul has successfully persuaded his audience members to see the Israelites as he sees them, and to feel about them the way that he feels about them, then he has succeeded in creating a "sameness of vision" between himself and his audience members.[229] Furthermore, if he has been successful, this "sameness of vision" also exists between his audience members themselves. As described in previous chapters, the creation of "sameness of vision" draws audience members closer to the author and closer to one another. This forms the foundation both for the intimacy the metaphor creates and also for the sense of identity the community gains from understanding and appropriating Paul's metaphor.[230]

---

[228] Beker, "The Faithfulness of God," 14.
[229] Cohen, *Thinking of Others*, 22-24.
[230] See also Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 10-12.

4.3.1. Creation of Intimacy

In the other υἱοθεσία metaphors, the sameness of vision Paul achieves is primarily directed inward toward other members of the community Paul is addressing, coloring and influencing how they perceive one another. What is unique about the metaphor in Romans 9:4 is that the sameness of vision, rather than being directed inward toward members of the community, is directed toward the entity "Israel." In light of this significant difference between the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4 and the other occurrences of υἱοθεσία, the intimacy the metaphor creates as it appears in Romans 9:4 takes on several new dimensions. Beyond creating intimate bonds between audience members through the recognition of a shared vision of Israel, the metaphor created feelings of intimacy between Paul's audience members *and the Israelites*, who in Romans 9:4 receive the same designation of υἱοθεσία that Paul has already predicated of believers. To investigate the implications of the intimacy Paul achieves with his metaphor in Romans 9:4, each of these cultivations of intimacy between author, audience, and the Israelites must be examined separately and in more detail.

Like the metaphors examined in previous chapters, Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4 creates an intimate connection between Paul and his audience members that arises from their shared understanding of the Israelites as receiving υἱοθεσία from God,[231] since metaphors by nature create bonds between their sharers and barriers for those outside the community.[232] As Trebilco states, "while a community will use language in its own distinctive way to construct and maintain its identity, to construct meaning, and to symbolise loyalty and solidarity, that language,

---

[231] Coupled closely with Paul's success in creating a sameness of vision is the potential that Paul's use of υἱοθεσία as the designation for Israel's sonship created sameness of vision for how his audience perceives other manifestations of the sonship tradition. For those audience members who were aware of the intertextual relationship between Romans 9:4 and other texts in the sonship tradition it is probable that Paul's metaphor reinterpreted at least some aspects of the understanding of Israel's sonship created by those texts. For the audience members who were aware of these relationships, Paul's metaphor in Romans 9:4 potentially cultivated a high degree of intimacy resulting not only from a shared understanding of the Israelites, which is apparent from a surface reading of Romans 9:4, but also from a shared understanding of the whole history of Israel's designation as the υἱός or υἱοί of YHWH. This also assumes that Paul was successful in achieving the sameness of vision created by the metaphor and the attendant intertextual connections. Of course it is also possible that some members were not persuaded to join in Paul's vision of the Israelites as adopted sons. For those members then, no intimate bond would have been created by the metaphor. For a further explanation of this phenomenon see Cohen, "Some Philosophy," 30-45.

[232] Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 12.

once used, impacts on how identity is understood."[233] This is the same dialectic created by Paul's metaphor in Romans 9:4, which extends an invitation to the audience members to participate with its creator (in this case Paul) in viewing its subject (in this case Israel's relationship with God) through a particular cognitive framework (in this case υἱοθεσία).[234] Moreover, when the audience member decides to join in, Paul has not only succeeded in communicating cognitive content about the metaphor's subject, but also has succeeded in creating an intimate bond between himself and the audience member in regard to how they both understand Israel.[235]

This is particularly poignant for Paul's metaphor in Romans 9:4 because the intimate bond is created by a sameness of vision that is directed outward, toward a group of people (the Israelites) who themselves might not share in the vision Paul has cast for them. Because the metaphor is directed toward a group outside Paul's addressees,[236] the metaphor in Romans 9:4 is even more likely to create the recognition that the "figurative use can be inaccessible to all but those who share information about one another's knowledge beliefs, intentions, and attitudes."[237] Paul's application of a unique term for the privilege of the ethnic Israelites, while affirming their continuing status before God, also creates a strong intimate bond between himself and his audience members who can participate with him in viewing ethnic Israel through his particular construct of υἱοθεσία.

One surprising element of the intimacy created by Paul's use of υἱοθεσία is its potential to have effected a perceived bond between the Israelites and the believers. Paul, by utilizing the same cognitive structure through which believers view themselves and through which believers view ethnic Israel creates the potential for feelings of empathy and intimacy toward the Israelites. However, it is unlikely that the Israelites who were not part of the community of Christ-followers would have recognized this bond of intimacy created by the shared designation of "adopted son,"

---

[233] Trebilco, *Self-Designations*, 8.
[234] See chapter 3 for a fuller discussion; see also Cohen, "Metaphor and the Cultivation of Intimacy," 1-10.
[235] For a related discussion of the *pathos* Paul achieves, see Elliott, *The Rhetoric of Romans*, 122-24.
[236] Paul's consistent use of third plural pronouns throughout Romans 9-11, rather than first plural or second plural suggests that although he wishes to underscore the commonality between Israel and his audience, he addresses "Israel" as a group absent from the conversation he is presently having with his community of readers. However, this does not preclude the strong possibility that at least some among Paul's audience were Jewish-Christians, and thus were included in the group he addresses directly (*pace* Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans*, and Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*).
[237] Cohen, "Cultivation of Intimacy," 7.

which Paul predicates both of Israelites and Christ-followers. Nevertheless, despite the fact that the Israelites might not all share Paul's willingness to designate both Jews and Gentiles as adopted sons of God, it is arguable that *Paul's audience* might have understood some intimate bond existing between themselves and the people of Israel. Trebilco observes, "In adopting OT terminology and applying it to themselves within the group, the Christians are claiming to be in continuity with the people of God in the OT."[238] In using the label υἱοθεσία, Paul highlights what he deems to be an important shared feature between the Israelites and the Christian community, the bond of fictive kinship. If Paul's audience adopts his vision of ethnic Israelites, the feelings of intimacy Paul is able to cultivate by using the same metaphorical designation for Israelites and believers provide Paul with a strong starting point for the rest of his argument regarding the fate of Israel. The symmetry of designations for believers and ethnic Israel creates a vested interest for the believers in what outcome awaits their fellow adopted sons.

4.3.2 Creation of Identity

As described in previous chapters, metaphors can function as powerful forces in the formation of group identity.[239] Metaphors can function as agents that reinforce group boundaries by creating a barrier between community members who share a "sameness of vision" and outsiders who are unable to understand the metaphor.[240] Group members also often utilize metaphors to label common group experience or self-understanding, thus the metaphor becomes a symbolic representation of the shared experiences of group members.[241] Significant for our discussion here, I also noted that not all metaphors are "identity forming metaphors."[242] Indeed, in examining Paul's metaphorical designation of the Israelites as adopted sons it is tempting to conclude that this metaphor does little to form or reshape the group identity of Paul's audience because it is not directed at his audience members. To be

---

[238] Trebilco, *Self-Designations*, 308.
[239] See section 3.2 of chapter 3.
[240] Recall also that "understanding" the metaphor in the fullest sense means to be able to experience the metaphor's attendant emotions and share in the intimate bond between the metaphor maker and metaphor understanders. Cohen, *Thinking of Others*, 22-24; Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 12.
[241] Zhang, "Corporate Identity," 390-91.
[242] The less idiosyncratic and the more common a metaphor is in the dominant culture, the less likely it is that the use of the metaphor influences the self-understanding of a particular sub-group; see sections 2.2.2 and 2.3.4 of chapter 2 for a fuller discussion.

sure, because the metaphor in Romans 9:4 is a description of "the Israelites,"—a group that Paul ostensibly sees as distinct, at least in some ways, from his addressees—perhaps it is unlikely that the metaphor had as much impact on the self-understanding of Paul's audience as other occurrences of υἱοθεσία where the metaphor is applied directly to his audience members.

However, even this occurrence of υἱοθεσία contributes to the self-understanding of Paul's audience members, despite it being applied to the Israelites. First, Paul's idiolectic use of υἱοθεσία as a metaphorical description creates a "sameness of vision" of the Israelites that can only be shared by members of Paul's addressees (since it is not used elsewhere). Thus although the metaphor is applied to "outsiders," it still subtly reinforces a boundary around the community's understanding of Israelites as "adopted sons" in contrast to the other terms for sonship found in other sources. Yet somewhat paradoxically, while subtly erecting a boundary around the group the metaphor also overtly emphasizes the commonality between the Israelites and the believers who are both "adopted sons." Paul's symmetrical use of υἱοθεσία of both believers and Israelites may have functioned to draw the believers into the story of Israel, wherein all of the adopted sons stand in solidarity as children of Israel's God.[243] In saying this I do not mean to suggest that the metaphor did away with some key distinctions between the Israelites and believers that seems to be inherent in Paul's argument in Romans 9-11.[244] Rather, the symmetry of Paul's designation for believers and Israelites indicates the intrinsic tension between the Israelites as the recipients of God's promises but whose rejection of Jesus as Messiah has also, in Paul's mind, rendered them outsiders to the community of Christ-followers. Moreover, the metaphor points to Paul's extension and reappropriation of these promises made originally to the Israelites for the community of believers as a whole, both Jew and gentile. Each of these proposals for the role of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4 in identity formation require a thorough analysis before either can be adopted with any certainty.

---

[243] The story of Israel and the story of Christ as Israel's Messiah are inseparable for Paul. Richard Hays captures this well: "The logic of Paul's gospel narrative is *participatory*….[W]e become incorporated in Christ, so that our fate is bound together not only with him, but also with our brothers and sisters in him" ("Is Paul's Gospel Narratable?," *JSNT* 27.2 (2004): 235.

[244] See Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 117-48 for an excellent explanation of the importance of distinguishing between kinship and ethnicity in Paul's letters.

As noted earlier, υἱοθεσία as a description of Israel's sonship is unique to Paul, and that other sources who designate Israel as the son of God prefer the terms υἱός/υἱοί, πρωτότοκος and μονογενής for the vehicles of their metaphors. Here, then, the task is to examine the possible impact Paul's unique term had on the *formation of identity for his addressees*. Though it may seem a rather minor point given the prevalence of other sonship metaphors predicated of Israel, the fact that only Paul uses the term υἱοθεσία as a designation for Israel's sonship means that only Paul's addressees are extended the opportunity to view Israel's sonship through his unique construct of υἱοθεσία.

Moreover, those addressees who are familiar with other texts of the sonship tradition have the opportunity to reinterpret those texts in light of the Pauline metaphor. Indeed, it is possible that the uniqueness of the Pauline metaphor in Romans 9:4 actually creates a shared experience of reflecting on the metaphor for Paul's audience members. This is not to say that the addressees were consciously reflecting on the differences between Paul's unique term υἱοθεσία and other, more common terms for sonship in the Old Testament and intertestamental sources. Indeed, reflection on the metaphor need not be a conscious cognitive exercise. Greg Dawes argues that the hearer may not be fully aware of the way in which the cognitive model which underlies a metaphorical expression shapes his or her thought.[245] Thus it is possible, whether Paul's audience members were conscious of the metaphor's potential or not, that υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4 is working subliminally to reframe the understanding of Israel's sonship within the collective of Paul's addressees.

When the collective adopts this new understanding of Israel as the adopted sons of God they also partake in sharing the unique "sameness of vision" created by the metaphor. The unique sameness of vision Paul achieves in his metaphor in Romans 9:4 distinguishes his community members (who share in his vision) from all other "outsiders" who, for various reasons, would reject Paul's metaphorical description of Israel's adopted sonship. The uniqueness of Paul's metaphor, and the correlated uniqueness of the "sameness of vision" Paul achieves, *is precisely what aids in the construction of group identity*. Through the performative utterance in Romans 9:4, Paul's addressees become "those who understand the Israelites as the *adopted* sons of God."

---

[245] Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 69.

At the same time Paul's metaphor is subtly creating a boundary around his addressees by means of a sameness of vision of Israel's sonship, his metaphor in Romans 9:4 also draws a plain parallel between the sonship of believers and the sonship of the Israelites. If υἱοθεσία were an example of an unremarkable, pedestrian metaphor then we might be able to dismiss the identical designations in Romans 8 and Romans 9 as equally unremarkable. However, this is decidedly not the case. The metaphorical use of υἱοθεσία is unparalleled, and thus its application to these two distinct subjects is significant because of their scarcity. Richard Hays has persuasively argued that Paul is "a first-century Jewish thinker who, while undergoing a profound disjuncture with his own religious tradition, grappled his way through to a vigorous and theologically generative reappropriation of Israel's scriptures."[246] This raises the question of how Paul's reappropriation, and re-labeling, of Israel's sonship might help Paul's audience to find its identity within God's story of election and redemption.[247] Furthermore, N. T. Wright notes that Paul's primary concern is to reconfigure the story of God's covenant people around their shared eschatological destiny through Israel's Messiah.[248]

If Hays and Wright are correct, and Paul is urging his readers to reimagine their identity around the Messiah of Israel, or perhaps even more pointedly, to reimagine Israel in light of Christ as Israel's Messiah, then is it possible that υἱοθεσία provides a point of commonality for these twin assertions? Throughout Romans 9-11 there is an interesting dialectic between the Israelites as the recipients of the privileges (9:4) and the "cultivated olive tree's natural branches," and Paul's addressees (presumably mostly gentiles) whom he describes in contrasting terms such as "not my people" (9:26), "those who did not seek me" (10:20), and "a wild olive shoot" (11:17). However, though Paul draws a distinction between the Israelites and his addressees, his use of the same metaphor—υἱοθεσία—as a description for both believers and Israelites, and his continual reinterpretation and reappropriation of Scripture throughout Romans 9-11 suggests that he sees tremendous continuity between the believers and the Israelites.[249] Perhaps what Paul achieves in labeling the

[246] Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 2.
[247] See also Hays, *Conversion of the Imagination*, 147-48.
[248] Wright, *Paul: In Fresh Perspective*, 135-40.
[249] See also Bruce Longenecker, "Sharing in Their Spiritual Blessings?: The Stories of Israel in Galatians and Romans," in *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, ed. Bruce W. Longenecker (Louisville: *WJK*, 2002), 58-84; Morna Hooker, "'Heirs of Abraham': The Gentiles' Role

Israelites with the same kind of sonship as the believers is an identity for his addressees that stands in solidarity and continuity with the people of Israel. As Dunn notes, the choice of υἱοθεσία "was evidently deliberately chosen to remind the predominantly gentile audience that the blessings they share are Israel's blessings."[250] This is further evidenced by the nature of υἱοθεσία itself. Whereas a metaphor built upon natural or biological sonship does not easily transcend ethnic barriers, υἱοθεσία is uniquely positioned to ascribe an equal status of sonship to both the ethnic Israelites and the believers, though there was undoubtedly ethnic diversity represented between these groups of people.[251] Perhaps it is here that Paul's metaphor is truly revolutionary. Whereas some other sonship metaphors (e.g. πρωτότοκος or μονογενής) would likely have communicated connotations of ethnic exclusivity for the Israelites, Paul's use of υἱοθεσία can affirm the ethnic particularity of Israel as the recipients of God's covenant while simultaneously extending the possibility of sonship beyond the confines of the Israelites, precisely because God's people, both Jew and gentile, are sons by *adoption* and not birth. Thus Paul's addressees can participate fully in Israel's heritage and in Israel's messiah because they have been included in the family of YHWH in the same manner as the Israelites themselves, through *adoption*.

5. Conclusion

In this chapter I have sought to demonstrate that far from being a traditional, unremarkable, or pedestrian way of referring to Israel as the covenant people of God, Paul's metaphorical designation of υἱοθεσία for ethnic Israel reframes and reinterprets numerous aspects of Israel's history and scripture, and reshapes Paul's audience's understanding of their own identity as co-participants with Israel in the adoption to sonship. To be sure, Paul's metaphor in Romans 9:4 occurs in a drastically different frame than the two previous occurrences of υἱοθεσία in Romans 8, and its tenor has shifted its referent from the identity of believers (Romans 8:15-23) to Paul's own familial description of God's covenant relationship with Israel in Romans 9. Moreover, I noted that because Paul's metaphor uses an original term for Israel's sonship—υἱοθεσία—and because this term has been repeated from Romans 8, we can

---

in Israel's Story: A Response to Bruce W. Longenecker," in *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, ed. Bruce W. Longenecker (Louisville: *WJK*, 2002), 85-96.

[250] Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 2, 522.

[251] So Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 117-35.

characterize Paul's metaphor in Romans 9:4 as one possessing both emphasis and resonance. Indeed, the υἱοθεσία metaphor sets the tone for the unfolding theme of sonship, which occurs throughout Paul's discourse in Romans 9.

Furthermore, I argued that the predication of υἱοθεσία of the Israelites raised an unusual intertextual issue in Romans 9:4 because Paul is not "transposing" an allusion or echo from another text, but rather creating his own "reflection" by using idiosyncratic terminology to simultaneously evoke and reinterpret other earlier texts where "Israelite sonship" occurs. In so doing, Paul simultaneously affirms the particularity of Israel's sonship through election while also extending the possibility of sonship beyond the confines of ethnic Israel. The overall effect of the metaphor is to shape the perception of the Israelites for Paul's audience through the specific cognitive framework of adoption over and against competing frameworks, such as πρωτότοκος. Because Paul's metaphor is highly specific to his view of Israel, it has a strong potential for effecting feelings of intimacy and creating a distinct identity within the community of his audience. In Romans 9:4, Paul's metaphor achieves a "sameness of vision" in regard to Israel, ultimately uniting his audience together in their shared concern for Israel as God's chosen people, and their brothers and sisters through adoption.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In this thesis I have sought to demonstrate the need for a rigorous and well-rounded methodology for reading the υἱοθεσία metaphors within the biblical text. I argued that although previous studies have addressed the question of the metaphors' background in great detail, reading biblical metaphors requires a sophisticated and carefully thought out hermeneutic that combines knowledge of background and historical context with an understanding of how metaphors as textual elements work with their underlying models and their surrounding literary context (frames) to create meaning. Furthermore, I argued that a rigorous methodology must also examine a metaphor's extra-textual elements, which influence the perceptions, emotions, and identity of its hearers/readers. The three exegetical chapters (chapters 5-7) utilized this methodology to demonstrate that although the υἱοθεσία metaphors have some overlap in their content, there are also subtle nuances in their meanings and in the ways they likely shaped the perceptions and affective responses within Paul's audiences in Rome and Galatia.

1. Concluding Summary and Synthesis

1.1 The Contribution of Each Chapter

In the first section of the thesis I offered a defense of a methodology for reading the υἱοθεσία metaphors that utilized insights from a cross-section of disciplines, drawing mainly on advances in the areas of philosophy of language and cognitive linguistics. This methodology represents a significant paradigm shift from the way the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans and Galatians have historically been approached and interpreted. I argued that utilizing a methodology more attuned to the ways in which metaphors work to produce meaning and perception would illuminate aspects of the υἱοθεσία metaphors that often are under-appreciated in studies which treat the interpretation of metaphors as a straightforward process.

After identifying the methodological shortcomings of previous studies on the υἱοθεσία metaphors in chapter one, in chapter two I addressed the textual elements of a metaphor, including the problem of defining a metaphorical utterance and the locus of metaphorical meaning. I argued that Soskice's definition of a metaphor as "that

figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another," would provide the highest level of precision for identifying and pinpointing the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans and Galatians. Drawing on Soskice's insights, I argued that the meaning of the υἱοθεσία metaphors occurs at the level of a complete utterance, and thus it is inappropriate to speak of a univocal metaphorical meaning for the lexeme υἱοθεσία. Moreover, I showed that as textual elements, metaphors are significantly impacted by changes in their frames and tenors. I also argued that although metaphors are multivalent in meaning, metaphorical meaning is not of a lower truth caliber than literal utterances. Indeed, metaphors often provide a window to truths that are only accessible through a particular metaphor. Thus it is important when addressing the υἱοθεσία metaphors not to think of them as metaphors "*for X,*" but as utterances which create meanings and mental states only accessible through the particular utterance and framework "υἱοθεσία."

In chapter three I demonstrated the value of combining insights from cognitive linguistics and sociolinguistics that illuminate the extra-textual features of a metaphor with the theories of chapter two which treat metaphor as a textual phenomenon. Drawing upon the insights of cognitive theorists such as Lakoff, Johnson, Turner, and Kövecses I argued that in order to understand the full impact of the υἱοθεσία metaphors one must also attend to the cognitive structure they provide and the affective responses they were likely to elicit. Rather than being neutral conduits of information, cognitive theorists have showed metaphors to be powerful performative utterances which structure the perceptions of their readers/hearers by highlighting and hiding certain features of their subjects (tenors). Moreover, in addition to their cognitive content, Cohen and Kövecses have argued that metaphors elicit emotional responses from their audiences. Cohen has further asserted that these emotional responses contribute to feelings of intimacy between author and audience members by creating a "sameness of vision" regarding the metaphor's subject. This "sameness of vision" creates bonds between those who participate in the metaphor (the author and the audience members) and erects barriers for community outsiders (who do not share the "sameness of vision"). Given the capacity of metaphors to influence not only extra-textual elements (such as cognition and perception) but also to influence areas that go beyond cognitive content (e.g. emotion and identity), I argued that metaphors also have a powerful social function within communities. Thus in analyzing the υἱοθεσία metaphors one must attend to the way these metaphors likely influenced the

perception of Paul's audience members, and also to the social function of these metaphors in terms of their capacity to create a "sameness of vision" and solidify the bonds and boundaries for the members of the communities in Rome and Galatia.

In chapter four I provided a rough sketch of the various models which might underlie the υἱοθεσία metaphors in the Pauline text, and I also addressed how these models work within each metaphorical utterance to create meaning. Because Paul's audience members were most likely influenced by both Greco-Roman practices of adoption and by texts in the Jewish sonship tradition, each of these backgrounds were examined to provide a foundation for the discussions of model and vehicle in each exegetical chapter. One critical distinction between my methodological approach and that of previous studies is my assertion that a metaphor's meaning cannot be reduced to its model (or background), nor is it possible to conclude that only one model is present to the exclusion of all others. However, I also argued that although no one model can be completely ruled out, the various frames of the metaphors sometimes bring one model closer to the surface and push another further under in submersion. Thus the models are not equally present in every context, or for every reader/hearer, but rather each context suggests some models more strongly than others.

In part two of the thesis I sought to demonstrate the usefulness of a methodology drawn from contemporary metaphor theories for analyzing the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans and Galatians in exegesis. In each chapter I identified the metaphorical utterance (or utterances) and the frames in which υἱοθεσία occurred, and then argued for the most likely candidate for the metaphor's model, tenor, and vehicle. In addition, I also treated the extra-textual features of each υἱοθεσία metaphor, identifying the ways in which these metaphors influenced the perceptions of the audience members regarding the metaphors' tenors and the various emotional responses they likely elicited. I then argued that these extra-textual features contributed to feelings of intimacy and a "sameness of vision" created between Paul and his audience members, which solidified bonds between them and erected boundaries for outsiders.

In comparing each exegetical chapter the differences between the υἱοθεσία metaphors are easily seen, both in terms of their textual features and in terms of the effect on the perceptions, emotions, and identity of their respective audiences. In light of the methodological premise that metaphors are not easily synthesized into a univocal meaning, it is prudent to review the individual contribution of each υἱοθεσία

metaphor and to highlight these differences before carefully moving toward a synthetic analysis. In chapter five I treated the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5, and I argued that the primary emphasis of the υἱοθεσία metaphor was to change the way Paul's audience of Galatian gentiles perceived and understood their spiritual lineage. In light of the agitators' emphasis on the importance of lineage through law observance, Paul is concerned with establishing a framework that provides a spiritual lineage which bypasses the need for his gentile audience to observe Torah. Υἱοθεσία accomplishes this in Galatians 4:5. By using υἱοθεσία as a cognitive framework through which to view inclusion in the people of God, Paul made clear that sonship came through the initiative of the Father, was carried out by the mission of the Son, and attested through the witness of the Spirit. Thus the vertical elements of the υἱοθεσία metaphor regarding how the believers related to God were most prominent in Galatians 4:5. Moreover, Paul grounded his υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 in the community's shared experience of receiving the Spirit, which intimately connected the Spirit to sonship and solidified their assurance of their spiritual lineage as children of God.

In chapter six I analyzed the diptych of υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8:15 and Romans 8:23, and argued that these two metaphors work to produce the perception of acute eschatological and existential tension for Paul's audience in Rome. Unlike the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5, the two metaphors in Romans 8 contain a much stronger emphasis on the horizontal dimensions of community membership. Paul's frame in Romans 8 connects the audience's reception of the Spirit of υἱοθεσία with their experience as co-sufferers with Christ (Rom 8:17), and with their feeling of eschatological displacement and longing for the completion of their restoration (Rom 8:23). This emphasis on displacement solidifies the bonds between members of Paul's audience by creating a "sameness of vision" which highlights their shared existence as those who belong to the age to come and deemphasizes their relationship to the things of the flesh (τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς). Thus the diptych of metaphors in Romans 8 provides a filial and familial grid through which the believers in Rome process their community membership and their experiences of suffering, displacement, and hope.

In chapter seven I analyzed the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4, which is arguably the most vexing and difficult occurrence from a methodological standpoint. Although I argued that the predominant model in play for the υἱοθεσία metaphors in

Galatians 4 and in Romans 8 was Greco-Roman adoption, in Romans 9:4 the Jewish sonship tradition as a model for υἱοθεσία is drawn firmly into view. However, because υἱοθεσία does not occur in the LXX or in the intertestamental literature, the intertextual relationships between the Pauline metaphor in Romans 9:4 and other texts in the Jewish sonship tradition are together a complicated and intricate example of metalepsis. Rather than Paul merely appropriating material from precursor texts, Paul uses his own metaphor (υἱοθεσία) to function as a reflecting surface that constrains and interprets the texts he draws upon. As Paul's reflection, the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4 highlights God's elective and covenantal actions toward Israel while hiding the importance of natural descent. Moreover, because υἱοθεσία separates sonship from natural descent, Paul's use of υἱοθεσία as a vehicle to describe God's covenant relationship with Israel extends the possibility of sonship to non-Israelites much more readily than the vehicles such as πρωτότοκος and μονογενής, which are present in other iterations of sonship metaphors in precursor texts. Unlike the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8, the "sameness of vision" Paul achieves through his metaphor in Romans 9:4 directs the attention of the community toward Israel rather than towards themselves. However, this sameness of vision highlights the commonality between Israel and believers as those who have been designated adopted sons. Their shared designation elicits an emotional response from Paul's audience members to lament over the fate of Israel as not only Paul's, but also their kinsfolk through adoption (e.g. Rom 9:1-3).

The foregoing study has demonstrated several broad implications for research on biblical metaphors, and on the υἱοθεσία metaphor in particular. First, biblical scholars researching and interpreting biblical metaphors should attend not only to issues concerning historical context and background, but also to the hermeneutical complexities inherent in the analysis of metaphor. Second, the tendency to synthesize multiple occurrences of the "same" metaphor into a univocal meaning must be resisted. Synthesis, if it is to occur, must be attempted only after each metaphor is treated in its own right and the differences in metaphorical meaning between contexts adequately addressed and appreciated. Third, any complete analysis of the υἱοθεσία metaphors must address both its textual and extra-textual elements, and attend to the ways in which these elements differ between the various contexts in which these metaphors occur. Attending to these elements will allow the rich, varied, and

multivalent qualities of the metaphor to speak with new voices and open new areas of inquiry for future studies.

1.2 Toward a Synthesis

Having treated each of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors in its own right in the previous exegetical chapters, here a few remarks of synthesis regarding the spectrum of meanings created by the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans and Galatians are warranted. However, although I will here put forth a synthesis of several aspects of the υἱοθεσία metaphors, I do not mean to imply that it is appropriate to distill them into a univocal meaning drawn from the sum total of their meanings in their individual contexts. Rather, the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans and Galatians are much more akin to the bands of color in a rainbow; one must not be tempted to remove the methodological prism that shows them to be discrete colors that comprise a beam of white light. Instead, the prism must continue to be used to appreciate the distinct colors that make up the spectrum of meaning of the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans and Galatians, while also keeping in mind that these colors are contiguous parts of the whole spectrum.

1.2.1 The Role of Models and Frames

As I stated above, there are subtle differences in the meanings and implications of the υἱοθεσία metaphors as they appear in their individual contexts. In addition, several other prominent differences emerge into view if the results of the exegetical analysis of each metaphor are compared. Chief among these differences is that the relationship between the υἱοθεσία metaphor and its underlying model changes slightly in each context. In Galatians 4:5 and Romans 8:15 the predominant model in view is that of Roman adoption, in Romans 8:23 the metaphor's connection to the model of Roman adoption is slightly more vague, whereas in Romans 9:4 the Jewish sonship model predominates, but is interwoven with the model of Roman adoption. The shifting models underlying the four υἱοθεσία metaphors produce a spectrum of meaning based on a range of possible associations these models evoke, which may vary slightly or substantially between contexts. This finding is significant because it demonstrates the inadequacy of attempting to identify and associate a single background for a biblical metaphor. Rather, the relationship between metaphor and model is complex and somewhat fluid between contexts.

Moreover, as I stated above, each iteration of a υἱοθεσία metaphor communicates a slightly different set of implications and creates a slightly different cognitive framework for the audience members, in large part because of the differences between their surrounding frames and underlying models. Thus the audiences in Galatia and Rome come away with slightly different, though undoubtedly complementary, understandings of the significance of their adoption as believers in Christ. In Galatians 4:5 the metaphor functions to underscore the inclusion of the gentiles in the community of faith by God's adoption rather than by law observance. Because Paul's primary objective in Galatians was to convince the Galatian believers that their inclusion in the community of God is through the faithful death of Jesus rather than through observance of the Law, he uses the υἱοθεσία metaphor to highlight another facet of God's initiating act to bring humanity into relationship with him. Thus for the Galatian audience, the υἱοθεσία metaphor primarily functions to enrich their understanding of God's inclusive action towards them and, as a result of that action, their full inclusion in the community of God. Moreover, the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians is not overly fraught with emotional language, and the emotional content of the metaphor again emphasizes the relational closeness of the believer and God through the ʻ*abbā* cry of the Spirit. Like the cognitive framework created by the metaphor in Galatians 4:5, the metaphor's emotional content further highlights the vertical implications of the metaphor by focusing the audience's attention on the intimate bond adoption creates between the Triune God and the believer, which is evidenced by the Spirit's cry from the heart.

For the community in Rome, Paul uses the υἱοθεσία metaphors primarily to highlight the eschatological and existential tension that characterizes life in the community of faith. Moreover, the combination of the three υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans highlights the commonality between Jews and gentiles by emphasizing that God extends sonship to both groups through adoption. In Romans 9:4 the emotional response evoked by the υἱοθεσία metaphor functions primarily to create feelings of sorrow and empathy for unbelieving Israel. Like the metaphors in Romans 8:15-23, this emotional response primarily emphasizes the horizontal bonds between believers who share a "sameness of vision" toward Israel. Through highlighting the shared identity of the believers and the Israelites as sons of God, and their shared experience of eschatological and existential displacement, the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans solidify the bonds between the audience members in Rome and the boundaries around

the Roman community of believers. At the same time, the combination of the three metaphors creates an empathic view of Israel and a shared experience of Paul's angst and sorrow over his ethnic kinsfolk.

Likewise, the emotional responses evoked by the three υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans differ in some important ways from the emotional response evoked by the metaphor in Galatians 4:5. The combination of the two υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8:15-23 elicits an emotional response from the audience that reflects the tension present throughout the passage, which is seen in both the dichotomous pairings of σάρξ and πνεῦμα, and in the motif of groaning and suffering. In Romans 8, the υἱοθεσία metaphor highlights the emotional, existential, and eschatological tension the believers experience as they are caught between the σάρξ and πνεῦμα, tension which Paul portrays as endemic to the life of the believer. As the υἱοθεσία metaphor works in conjunction with its surrounding frame to highlight the existential and the emotional tension which characterizes life in the community of faith, the believers in Rome are drawn together in intimate bonds which emphasize their common ground and shared experiences.

In sum, the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians creates a cognitive framework and elicits an emotional response that sharply emphasizes the vertical dimensions of the metaphor whereas the cognitive framework created by the three υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans brings the metaphors' horizontal implications to the fore. Here, at the end of the exegetical process, these sets of implications may be now combined in order to speak of a Pauline "theology" of υἱοθεσία which includes insights from each adoption metaphor, or they may be kept separate in order to better appreciate the role each υἱοθεσία metaphor plays in tailoring Paul's argument to the specific concerns of his audience members.

1.2.2 Areas of Commonality between the Υἱοθεσία Metaphors in Romans and Galatians

However, although there are significant differences between the implicative complexes of the four metaphors, like the discrete colors which are joined together in a single beam of white light, in several areas the implications of the υἱοθεσία metaphors are also clearly contiguous parts of the same spectrum of meaning. For example, despite the differences in their underlying models, and differences in their frames and intended purposes, both Galatians 4:5 and Romans 9:4 emphasize God's

divine action in extending sonship apart from ethnicity. In both Romans and Galatians, whether predicated of Israelites or gentiles, Paul consistently portrays sonship as bestowed through God's divine initiative and transcendent of ethnic boundaries. Thus for Paul sonship is contingent upon the action and will of the Triune God, and the people of God are drawn into sonship through the covenanting actions of the Trinity. In all instances of the υἱοθεσία metaphor Paul portrays sonship in terms of adoption, which means that sonship in Paul's view is not inherited, but rather is brought about and bestowed through the gracious action of God.

A final noteworthy commonality between the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8:15-23 and Galatians 4:5 is their shared connection between adoption and the reception of the Spirit. Although their respective frames are different, and although the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 primarily highlights its vertical implications while the metaphors in Romans 8:15-23 emphasize the horizontal dimensions, in each case Paul grounds the υἱοθεσία metaphors predicated of believers in their experience of receiving the Spirit. Thus in both Romans and Galatians the υἱοθεσία metaphors (with the exception of Romans 9:4) provide a cognitive framework through which the audience views their experience of the Spirit. Through the υἱοθεσία metaphors, their shared experience of the Spirit also becomes a shared experience of sonship and familial belonging. Moreover, in both Romans and Galatians Paul connects the υἱοθεσία metaphor with the '*abbā* cry, which signals that the believers' adoption to sonship has brought them into an intimate relationship with the Father through their identification with the Son, to which the Spirit testifies in the hearts of the believers. This grounding of sonship in the experience of the Spirit also elicits a unifying emotional response from the believers, thus uniting not only the believers of the individual communities in Rome and Galatia, but potentially also creating a sense of unity between geographically dispersed Christian communities.

Undoubtedly much more could be said regarding the implications of the areas of synthesis I have identified for subsections of Pauline theology such as soteriology, eschatology, ecclesiology, and ethics. However, such an endeavor unfortunately falls beyond the purview of this study. Nevertheless, here it is enough to note that the diverse voices of the υἱοθεσία metaphors speak in harmony with one another, drawing upon a consistent portrayal of God's action toward humanity and grounding the sonship of believers in the shared experience of the Spirit. Thus although it is inappropriate to speak of a univocal "meaning" of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans

and Galatians, lest the subtleties of each occurrence of the metaphor and its individual cognitive framework and emotional response be minimized, it is appropriate to speak of the metaphors each contributing to a unified, consistent, and complementary picture of the Pauline idea of adoption to sonship. This unity occurs in the midst of the diversity of the metaphors and their implications, and must not be equated with uniformity. Rather, there is unity in the diversity of the metaphorical expressions, both in the themes of the metaphors themselves, and in their potential to unify the audiences of Paul's letters under the metaphorical expression of υἱοθεσία.

2. Moving Forward

2.1 Ephesians 1:5

Due to the complexities regarding the authorship and audience of Ephesians, treating the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Ephesians 1:5 was not possible in the limited purview of this study. However, wherever one lands on the debate over the authorship of Ephesians, treating the υἱοθεσία metaphor there would undoubtedly yield rich exegetical insights. While a full treatment of the metaphor in Ephesians 1:5 is not possible here, I will offer a few brief remarks regarding some of the most distinctive features of the metaphorical utterance and its place among the other υἱοθεσία metaphors in the Pauline corpus.

Unlike the υἱοθεσία metaphors I have chosen to include in this study, the metaphor in Ephesians 1:5 occurs in the opening blessing of the letter as part of a paean of praise to God the Father and Jesus Christ who has blessed the believers "with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places" (Eph 1:3). At first glance, the υἱοθεσία metaphor shares much in common with the metaphors in Galatians 4:5 and Romans 8; these four υἱοθεσία metaphors all describe some element of the believers' relationship to God, albeit with nuances in their various tenors. However, set in the context of a prayer, the frame of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Ephesians differs significantly from any of the other metaphorical utterances containing υἱοθεσία in Romans or Galatians. Though there is not sufficient space to address the impact of this frame on the meaning of the metaphor, perhaps it is enough here to point out that a frame which treats adoption as one of the spiritual blessings which God has lavished on those he chose "from the foundation of the world" has a significantly different

temporal reference than the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Galatians 4:5, Romans 8:15, and Romans 8:23 in particular. Indeed, Ephesians 1:4-5 is the only instance of the υἱοθεσία metaphor where the frame focuses on God's actions "before the foundation of the world" (πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου), making its focus temporally prior to any instance of the metaphor in Romans and Galatians. Although determining the impact this shift in frame has on the meaning of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Ephesians 1:5 is impossible without conducting a full examination, the methodology I proposed suggests that this change in frame would result in significant differences between the meaning of the metaphor in Ephesians 1:5 and other instances of υἱοθεσία metaphors.

Similar to the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4, the metaphor in Ephesians 1:5 likely functions as an introductory lens through which the rest of the kinship terms in Ephesians are filtered. Thus those who were formally "sons of disobedience" and "children of wrath" (Eph 2:2-3) have not only been brought into the family of God through υἱοθεσία (Eph 1:5), but they were chosen to be brought into this relationship with God before the foundation of the world. Moreover, the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Ephesians 1:5 might also have subtly changed the perceptions of the Gentile audience members regarding the way in which they were "brought near by the blood of Christ" (Eph 2:13). Similar to the function of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 which emphasizes the connection between υἱοθεσία and spiritual lineage, and to the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4 which emphasizes God's divine action in bringing about the sonship of the Israelites, the connection between God's electing initiative and sonship in Ephesians 1:5 affords the possibility of both Jews and Gentiles participating in sonship through adoption in Christ. Undoubtedly more could be said about both of the areas I identified as the most prominent features of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Ephesians 1:5, in addition to a full analysis yielding insights on how the υἱοθεσία metaphor might have influenced the emotions of the audience of Ephesians, or cultivated feelings of intimacy and community identity.

2.2 The Υἱοθεσία Metaphors in 21st-Century Contexts

In this thesis I devoted significant time and attention to addressing how the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans and Galatians might have influenced the perceptions and emotions of Paul's audiences in those locations. I argued that metaphors achieve this influence by imposing a cognitive framework that highlights and hides various elements of their subjects. I also argued that the υἱοθεσία metaphors extend an

invitation to their audiences through which they become participants in the narrative world of the metaphor. In the same way that the υἱοθεσία metaphors influenced the perceptions, emotions, and identity of their original audiences in Rome and Galatia, they continue to be used to influence Christian communities and congregations in contemporary contexts. Chief among the use and appropriation of the Pauline υἱοθεσία texts is their use in the literature of Christian adoption and orphan care movement that has recently gained significant ground within evangelical communities in the United States. Advocating for the priority of Christians to adopt orphans, Russell Moore states,

> Adoption is, on one hand, *gospel*. In this, adoption tells us who we are as children of the Father. Adoption as gospel tells us about our identity, our inheritance, and our *mission as sons of God.*…Missional adoption spurs us to join Christ in advocating for the helpless and the abandoned.[1]

While Moore's use of the Pauline texts to construct his narrative of Christian adoption in some ways seems admirable, these texts also have constructed a narrative framework that highlights only one perspective of the multifaceted and complex reality of contemporary practices adoption. For example, Moore's narrative creates the perception of the adoptees as "helpless" and "abandoned," and adoption as the "mission" to save them. However, speaking as an adult adoptee, I find that Moore's narrative gives me little space to wrestle through any feelings I might have toward my birth mother and first family. If adoption is "mission" or "rescue,"[2] as advocates of the movement often champion, then are adoptees *always* "rescued" from these first families by their adoptive parents? Clearly the realities are often much more complex, but the imposition of the Pauline adoption narrative on this contemporary context hides these realities and creates the perception that contemporary adoptions all follow the same story of "rescue" as the Christian's adoption by God the Father. Moreover, the narrative the metaphor creates hides completely from view any pain and struggle birth mothers face in the decision to relinquish children, and potentially creates an environment where these mothers are encouraged to relinquish because their children will be "saved" by adoption into Christian households.

---

[1] Russell D. Moore, *Adopted For Life: The Priority of Adoption for Christian Families & Churches* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2009).

[2] Jason Kovacs claims, "Our adoption of children serves as a window into Christ's rescue of us" ("Adoption and Missional Living," in *Reclaiming Adoption: Missional Living through the Rediscovery of Abba Father*, ed. Dan Cruver [Cruciform Press, 2011], 86).

The foregoing study has shown metaphors to be powerful communicative instruments with great potential to influence how their audiences perceive the world around them. Indeed, the ability of metaphors to influence not only the perceptions, but also the actions, of its audience members cannot be underestimated. In light of these conclusions, this study suggests that the utmost care must be taken when transposing biblical metaphors from their original contexts to contemporary contexts to ensure that their narratives do not inadvertently damage or marginalize the very groups whom they seek to empower. If the Christian orphan care and adoption movement is to use the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors responsibly, then it is imperative that these metaphors are presented in a way that gives voice to all parties involved in the adoption process in contemporary contexts, and does not import an unhealthy and destructive narrative into an already delicate and emotionally charged situation.

IX. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aasgaard, Reidar. *"My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!": Christian Siblingship in Paul.* Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 265. London: T & T Clark, 2004.

Abasciano, Brian J. "Corporate Election in Romans 9: A Reply to Tom Schreiner." *JETS* 49 (2006): 351-71.

_____. *Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9.1-9: An Intertextual and Theological Exegesis*. Library of New Testament Studies 301. London: T & T Clark, 2005.

Aletti, J. N. *Israël et la loi dans la lettre aux romains*. Paris: Cerf, 1998.

Alkier, Stefan. "Intertextuality and the Semiotics of Biblical Texts." In *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, eds. Stefan Alkier, Richard B. Hays, and Leroy A. Huizenga, 3-21. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009.

Andersen, Francis I., and David Noel Freedman. *Hosea*. Anchor Bible Commentary. Garden City: Doubleday, 1980.

Anderson, H. "3 Maccabees." In *OTP,* vol. 2, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 509-530. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983.

Aranda, Antonio. "Imagen de Dios en Christo – Hijos de Dios en Christo: Una Relectura de la Doctrina Anthropológica Paulina." *Scripta Theologica* 39.1 (2007): 37-72.

Aristotle. *The Art of Rhetoric*, trans. J. H. Freese. Loeb Classical Library 193. London: Heinemann, 1967.

_____. *Categories: On Interpretation*, trans. H. P. Cooke, and Hugh Tredennick. Loeb Classical Library 325. London: Heinemann, 1938.

Arnold, Clinton. "Returning to the Domain of the Powers: *Stoicheia* as Evil Spirits in Galatians 4:3, 9." *NovT* 38.1 (1996): 55-76.

Asano, Atsuhiro. *Community-Identity Construction in Galatians: Exegetical, Social-Anthropological and Socio-Cultural Studies*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 285. London: T & T Clark, 2005.

Atkinson, Kenneth. "On the Herodian Origin of Militant Davidic Messianism at Qumran: New Light from *Psalm of Solomon* 17." *JBL* 118.3 (1999): 435-60.

_____. "Towards a Redating of the Psalms of Solomon: Implications for Understanding the *Sitz im Leben* of an Unknown Jewish Sect." *JSP* 17 (1998): 95-112.

Austin, J. L. *How to Do Things With Words.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.

Auzépy, Marie-France. "Campagne de prospection 2007 de la mission Marmara." *Anatolia Antiqua* 15 (2007): 342-43.

Barclay, John M. G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE-117 CE).* Hellenistic Culture and Society 33. Berkley: University of California Press, 1996.

_____. *Obeying the Truth: Paul's Ethics in Galatians*. Vancouver: Regent College Publications, 2005.

_____. Review of *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles*, by Stanley Stowers. *JTS* 46.2 (1995): 646-51.

Barr, James. "'Abba' isn't 'Daddy.'" *JTS* 39 (1988): 28-47.

_____. *The Semantics of Biblical Language.* London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Barrett, C. K. *Epistle to the Romans.* Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1962.

Bassler, Jouette M. "Divine Impartiality in Paul's Letter to the Romans." *NovT* 26.1 (1984): 43-58.

Basson, Alec. *Divine Metaphors in Selected Hebrew Psalms of Lamentation*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament II 15. Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

Bauckham, Richard. "The Story of the Earth according to Paul: Rom 8:18-23." *RevExp* 108 (2011): 91-97.

Baur, F. C. "Über Zweck und Veranlassung des Römerbriefes und die damit Zusammenhängenden Verhältnisse der römischen Gemeinde." In *Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben: Historisch-Kritische Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, vol. 1, ed. Klaus Scholder, 147-266. Stuttgart: Fromman, 1963.

Beardsley, Monroe. "The Metaphorical Twist." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 22 (1962): 293-307.

Beker, J. Christiaan. "The Faithfulness of God and the Priority of Israel in Paul's Letter to the Romans." *HTR* 79 (1986): 10-16.

_____. *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.

_____. "Suffering and Triumph in Paul's Letter to the Romans." *HBT* 7.2 (1985): 105-119.

Becker, Jürgen. “Der Brief an die Galater.” In *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser, Philipper, Kolosser, Thessalonicher und Philemon*, 1-85. Das Neue Testament Deutsch 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985.

Belleville, Linda. “‘Under Law’: Structural Analysis and the Pauline Concept of Law in Galatians 3:21-4:11.” *JSNT* 26 (1986): 53-78.

Belth, Marc. *The Process of Thinking*. New York: David McKay, 1977.

Berkely, Bill. “Sounds of Violence: Rwanda’s Killer Radio.” *New Republic* 211 (1994): 18-19.

Berner, Christoph. *Die Exoduserzählung: das literarische Werden einer Ursprungslegende Israels.* Forschungen zum Alten Testament 73. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians.* Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

Bird, Michael. *The Saving Righteousness of God*. London: Paternoster, 2007.

Black, Max. “More About Metaphor” in *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed., ed. Andrew Ortony, 19-41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

_____. *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy*. Ithaca: Cornell, 1962.

Blum, Erhard. “Psalm 2,7c—eine performative Aussage.” In *Sefer Rendtorff: Festschrift zum 50sten Geburtstag von Rolf Rendtorff*, ed. Konrad Rupprecht, 4-8. Dielheimer Blätter zum Alten Testament und seiner Rezeption in der Alten Kirche 1. Dielheim: Self-published by authors, 1975.

Boecker, Hans Jochen. “Anmerkungen zur Adoption im Alten Testament.” *ZAW* 86.1 (1974): 86-89.

Boer, Martinus C. de. *Galatians.* New Testament Library. Louisville: WJK, 2011.

_____. Review of *The Irony of Galatians: Paul’s Letter in First-Century Context*. *BibInt* 12.4 (2004): 421-24.

Boers, Hendrikus. *Theology Out of the Ghetto: A New Testament Exegetical Study Concerning Religious Exclusiveness*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Booth, Wayne C. “Metaphor as Rhetoric: The Problem of Evaluation.” In *On Metaphor*, ed. Sheldon Sacks, 47-70. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

_____. *The Company We Keep: An Ethics of Fiction*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Bornet, Gérard. “Metapher: (Denk-) Anstoss zum Sprachwandel Bemerkungen zum Beitrag von Louise Röska-Hardy.” In *Metapher und Innovation: Die Rolle der Metapher im Wandel von Sprache und Wissenschaft*, eds. Henri Lauener, Andreas Graeser, and Gerhard Seel, 151-57. Bern: Haupt, 1995.

Boyarin, Daniel. “Was Paul an ‘Anti-Semite?’: A Reading of Galatians 3-4.” *USQR* 47 (1993): 47-80.

Branick, Vincent P. “Apocalyptic Paul?” *CBQ* 47.4 (1985): 664-75.

Brawley, Robert L. *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts.* Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1995.

Brettler, Marc Zvi. *God Is King: Understanding an Israelite Metaphor.* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 76. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.

Breytenbach, Cilliers. *Paulus und Barnabas in der Provinz Galatien: Studien zu Apostelgeschichte 13f.; 16,6; 18,23.* Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 38. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Broich, Ulrich. “Formen der Markierung von Intertextualität.” In *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, eds. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister, 31-47. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1985.

Broich, Ulrich. “Bezugsfelder der Intertextualität: Zur Einzeltextreferenz.” In *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, eds. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister, 48-52. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1985.

Brown, Michael J. “Paul’s use of ΔΟΥΛΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΙΗΣΟΥ in Romans 1:1.” *JBL* 120.4 (2001): 723-37.

Burchard, C. “Joseph and Aseneth.” In *OTP*, vol. 2, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 177-248. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983.

Burke, Kenneth. *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method.* Berkley: University of California Press, 1966.

Burke, Trevor. *Adopted into God’s Family: Exploring a Pauline Metaphor.* New Studies in Biblical Theology 22. Downers Grove: IVP, 2006.

_____. “Adoption and the Spirit in Romans 8.” *EvQ* 70 (1998): 311-24.

_____. “Adopted as Sons (ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ): The Missing Piece in Pauline Soteriology.” In *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman*, ed. Stanley Porter, 259-87. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

_____. “Pauline Adoption: A Sociological Approach.” *EvQ* 73 (2001): 119-34.

_____. *The Message of Sonship: At Home in God's Household*. Downers Grove: IVP, 2011.

Burkett, Delbert. *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation*. Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series 107. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Burri, Alex. "Metaphern, Modelle und wissenschaftliche Erklärgungen." In *Metapher und Innovation: Die Rolle der Metapher im Wandel von Sprache und Wissenschaft*, eds. Henri Lauener, Andreas Graeser, and Gerhard Seel, 268-89. Bern: Haupt, 1995.

Buscemi, Alfio Marcello. "Libertà e Huiothesia: Studio Esegetico di Gal 4,1-7." *LA* 30 (1980): 93-136.

Byrne, Brendan. *Romans.* Sacra Pagina. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996.

_____. *"Sons of God" – "Seed of Abraham": A Study of the Idea of the Sonship of God of All Christians in Paul against the Jewish Background*. Analecta Biblica 83. Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1979.

Bytwerk, Randall L. "The Argument for Genocide in Nazi Propaganda." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 91.1 (2005): 37-62.

Campbell, Douglas. "The Story of Jesus in Romans and Galatians." In *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, ed. Bruce W. Longenecker, 97-124. Louisville: WJK, 2002.

Campbell, William S. "The Addressees of Paul's Letter to the Romans." In *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner, 171-95. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Casey, Maurice. *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7*. London: SPCK, 1979.

Cassius, Dio Coccenianus. *Roman History*, 9 vols., trans. Earnest Carey. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1914-1927.

Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Cheon, Samuel. *The Exodus Story in the Wisdom of Solomon: A Study in Biblical Interpretation*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 23. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Chesnutt, Randall D. "The Social Setting and Purpose of Joseph and Aseneth." *JSP* 2 (1988): 21-48.

Childs, Brevard. *Exodus: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. London: SCM, 1974.

_____. *Isaiah*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: WJK, 2001.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *The Speeches: Pro Archia poeta, Post reditum in Senatu, Post reditum ad Quirites, De domo sua, De haruspicum responsis, Pro Plancio,* trans. N. H. Watts. Loeb Classical Library 158. London: Heinemann, 1923.

Cisneros, J. David. "Contaminated Communities: The Metaphor of 'Immigrant as Pollutant' in Media Representations of Immigration." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 11.4 (2008): 569-601.

Clark, Herbert H. *Using Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Coggins, Richard. "A Future for the Commentary?" In *The Open Text: New Directions for Biblical Studies*, ed. Francis Watson, 163-75. London: SCM Press, 1993.

Cohen, Anthony P. *The Symbolic Construction of Community*. London: Tavistock, 1985.

Cohen, Ted. "Metaphor and the Cultivation of Intimacy." In *On Metaphor*, ed. Sheldon Sacks, 1-10. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

_____. "Some Philosophy: 1." *Raritan* 10.2 (1990): 30-45.

_____. *Thinking of Others: On the Talent for Metaphor*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

Collins, Adela Yarbro. "The Origin of the Designation of Jesus as 'Son of Man.'" *HTR* 80 (1987): 391-408.

Collins, Adela Yarbro, and John J. Collins. *King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Collins, John J. *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: WJK Press, 1997.

_____. *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. New York: Doubleday, 1995.

_____. "The Son of God Text from Qumran." In *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*, ed. Martinus C. De Boer, 65-82. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

Collins, Raymond. *The Power of Images in Paul.* Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008.

Cone, James H. *The Cross and the Lynching Tree*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 2011.

Cook, James I. "The Concept of Adoption in the Theology of Paul." In *Saved by Hope: Essays in Honor of Richard C. Oudersluys*, ed. Brendan Byrne, 133-44. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.

Cooke, G. "The Israelite King as Son of God." *ZAW* 35 (1964): 22-47.

Corley, Kathleen. "Women's Inheritance Rights in Antiquity and Paul's Metaphor of Adoption." In *A Feminist Companion to Paul*, ed. Amy-Jill Levine, 98-121. Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 2004.

Corstan, Thomas. "Zu Inschriften aus Kleinasien." *EA* 37 (2004): 107-114.

Craghan, John F. "Esther, Judith, and Ruth: Paradigms for Human Liberation." *BTB* 12 (1982): 11-19.

Cranfield, C. E. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1990.

Cranford, Michael. "Election and Ethnicity: Paul's View of Israel in Romans 9:1-13." *JSNT* 50 (1993): 27-41.

Curcó, Carmen. "On Mosquitoes and Camels: Some Notes on the Interpretation of Metaphorically Transparent Popular Sayings." In *Figurative Language Comprehension: Social and Cultural Influences*, eds. Herbert L. Colston, and Albert N. Katz, 283-307. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2005.

Dahl, Nils. "Christ, Creation, and the Church." In *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology*, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube, 422-43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.

_____. *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1977.

Danneberg, Luz, Andreas Graeser, and Klaus Petrus. "Metapher und Innovation." In *Metapher und Innovation: Die Rolle der Metapher im Wandel von Sprache und Wissenschaft*, eds. Henri Lauener, Andreas Graeser, and Gerhard Seel, 9-21. Bern: Haupt, 1995.

Darr, John A. *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 163. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Davidson, Donald. "What Metaphors Mean." In *The Philosophy of Language*, 5th ed., ed. A. P. Martinich, 473-84. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Davidson, Ivor. "Salvation's Destiny: Heirs of God." In *God of Salvation: Soteriology in Theological Perspective*, ed. Ivor J. Davidson and Murray A. Rae, 155-75. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2011.

Davies, Glenn N. *Faith and Obedience in Romans*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 39. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.

Davies, W. D. Review of *Galatians*, by Hans Dieter Betz. *RelSRev* 7.4 (1981): 310-18.

Dawes, Gregory W. *The Body in Question: Metaphor and Meaning in the Interpretation of Ephesians 5:21-33*. Biblical Interpretation 30. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Day, Linda. "Faith, Character, and Perspective in Judith." *JSOT* 95 (2001): 71-93.

Dayton, Wilber T. "The New Testament Conception of Flesh." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 2.1 (1967): 7-17.

Debord, Pierre. "Religion et Societé: Les Fêtes D'Hécate et de Zeus à Stratonicée de Carie." In *Espaces et Pouvoirs dans l'Antiquité de l'Anatolie à la Gaule*, ed. Julie Dalaison, 239-50. Grenoble: CRHIPA, 2007.

Demosthenes. *Private Orations XLI-XLIX*, trans. A. T. Murray. Loeb Classical Library 346. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Derrida, Jacques. "The White Mythology: Metaphor in the Text of Philosophy," trans. F. C. T. Moore. *New Literary History* 6 (1974): 5-74.

DeSilva, David. *Seeing Things John's Way: The Rhetoric of the Book of Revelation*. Louisville: WJK, 2009.

Dillon, Richard. "The Spirit as Taskmaster." *CBQ* 60.4 (1998): 682-702.

Diodorus of Sicily. *XXI-XXXII*, trans. Francis R. Walton. Loeb Classical Library 409. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Dixon, Suzanne. *The Roman Family*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.

Dodd, C. H. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans.* Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932.

Dunn, James D. G. *Christology in the Making: An Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*, 2nd ed. London: SCM, 1989.

_____."Did Paul Have a Covenant Theology?: Reflections of Romans 9:4 and 11:27." In *Celebrating Romans: Template for Pauline Theology*, ed. Sheila E. McGinn, 3-19. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

_____. *The Epistle to the Galatians.* Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: A & C Black, 1993.

_____. *The New Perspective on Paul*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

_____. *Romans*, 2 vols. Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas: Word Books, 1988.

_____. "Spirit Speech: Reflections on Romans 8:12-27." In *Romans & the People of God*, eds. Sven K. Soderlund, and N. T. Wright, 82-91. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

_____. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Dupont-Sommer, André. *Essene Writings from Qumran*, trans. Géza Vèrmes. Oxford: Blackwell, 1961.

Durham, Deborah, and James W. Fernandez. "Tropical Dominions: The Figurative Struggle over Domains of Belonging and Apartness in Africa." In *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, ed. James W. Fernandez, 190-212. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.

Eastman, Susan. "Israel and the Mercy of God: A Re-reading of Galatians 6.16 and Romans 9-11." *NTS* 56 (2010): 367-95.

_____. "Whose Apocalypse: The Identity of the Sons of God in Romans 8:19." *JBL* 121.2 (2002): 263-77.

Eckhardt, Benedikt. "Reclaiming Tradition: The Book of Judith and Hasmonean Politics." *JSP* 18 (2009): 243-63.

Edwards, Elizabeth Gordon. "Exploring the Implications of Paul's Use of *Sarx* (Flesh)." In *Biblical Ethics & Homosexuality: Listening to Scripture*, ed. Robert Brawley, 69-75. Louisville: WJK, 1996.

Eliot, T. S. *The Complete Poems and Plays: 1900-1950*. New York: Harcourt, 1971.

Elliott, Neil. *The Rhetoric of Romans: Argumentative Constraint and Strategy and Paul's Dialogue with Judaism.* Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 45. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.

Embry, Brad. "The *Psalms of Solomon* and the New Testament: Intertextuality and the Need for a Re-Evaluation." *JSP* 13 (2002): 99-136.

Epp, Eldon. "Jewish-Gentile Continuity in Paul: Torah and/or Faith? (Romans 9:1-5)." *HTR* 79 (1986): 80-90.

Erickson, Millard. *Christian Theology*, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998.

Eyben, Emiel. "Fathers and Sons." In *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome*, ed. Beryl Rawson, 106-43. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Fahy, T. "St. Paul's Romans Were Jewish Converts." *ITQ* 26 (1959): 182-91.

Fee, Gordon. *Galatians: A Pentecostal Commentary.* Pentecostal Commentary Series, Dorset: Deo Publishing, 2007.

_____. *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.

_____. "Who are Abraham's True Children? The Role of Abraham in Pauline Argumentation." In *Perspectives on Our Father Abraham*, ed. Stephen Hunt, 126-37. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Feldman, Louis. *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Feldmeier, Reinhard. "Vater und Töpfer: Zur Identität Gottes in Römerbrief." In *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner, 377-90. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Fernandez, James W., ed. *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.

Ferré, Frederick. "Metaphors, Models, and Religion." *Soundings* 51.3 (1968): 327-45.

Firth, Simon. "Music and Identity." In *Questions of Cultural Identity*, eds. S. Hall and P. du Gay, 108-125. London: Sage, 1996.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The One Who Is To Come.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

_____. *Romans.* Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

Fowl, Stephen. "Who Can Read Abraham's Story?: Allegory and Interpretive Power in Galatians." *JSNT* 55 (1994): 77-95.

Fung, Ronald Y. K. *The Epistle to the Galatians.* New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

Garner, David B. "Adoption in Christ." Westminster Theological Seminary: Ph.D. Diss., 2002.

Gaston, Lloyd. *Paul and the Torah.* Vancouver: University of British Colombia Press, 1987.

Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. "Neither Height nor Depth: Discerning the Cosmology of Romans." *SJT* 64.3 (2011): 265-78.

_____. "On the Calling-Into-Being of Israel: Romans 9:6-29." In *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner, 255-69. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

_____. *Our Mother Saint Paul.* Louisville: WJK, 2007.

Getty, Mary Ann. "Paul on the Covenants and the Future of Israel." *BTB* 17 (1987): 92-99.

Gheorghita, Radu. *The Role of the Septuagint in Hebrews: An Investigation of Its Influence with Special Consideration to the Use of Hab 2:3-4 in Heb 10:37-38. Wissenschaftlich Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament: Series II 160*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Gianoulis, George C. "Is Sonship in Romans 8:14-17 a Link with Romans 9?" *BSac* 166 (2009): 70-83.

Gibbs, Raymond. "Metaphor Interpretation as Embodied Simulation." *Mind & Language* 21.3 (2006): 434-58.

_____. *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Glucksberg, Sam, and Boaz Keysar. "How Metaphors Work." In *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed., ed. Andrew Ortony, 401-24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Godet, Frederic. *Commentary on Romans*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1977.

Goodrich, John K. "Guardians, not Taskmasters: The Cultural Resonances of Paul's Metaphor in Galatians 4.1-2." *JSNT* 32.3 (2010): 251-84.

Gourgues, Michel. "La 'plénitude des temps,' ou le temps marqué de façon decisive par la réference à Jésus Christ. Polysémie d'une formule néotestamentaire (Mc 1,15; Ga 4,4; Ep 1,10)." *Science et Esprit* 53.1 (2001): 93-110.

Gray, Allison. *Psalm 118 in Words and Pictures*. Biblical Interpretation 127. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Gregg, J. A. F. *The Wisdom of Solomon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.

Grindheim, Sigurd. *The Crux of Election: Paul's Critique of the Jewish Confidence in the Election of Israel*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament: Series II 202. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Grudem, Wayne. "Does κεφαλή ('Head') Mean 'Source' or 'Authority Over' in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2336 Examples." *Trinity Journal* 6 (1985): 38-59.

_____. "The Meaning of κεφαλή ('Head'): A Response to Recent Studies." *Trinity Journal* 11 (1990): 3-72.

_____. *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.

Grzybek, Erhard. “Rhodische Inschriften.” *ZPE* 165 (2008): 72-73.

Gupta, Nijay. “Towards a Set of Principles for Identifying and Interpreting Metaphors in Paul: ΠΡΟΣΑΓΩΓΗ (Romans 5:2) as a Test Case.” *ResQ* 51.3 (2009): 169-81.

_____. *Worship that Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul’s Cultic Metaphors.* Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 175. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010.

Haacker, Klaus. “Das Thema von Römer 9-11 als Problem der Auslegungsgeschichte.” In *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner, 55-72. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

_____. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer.* Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 6. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2006.

Hallo, W. W. “Proverbs Quoted in Epic.” In *Lingering over Words: Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Literature in Honor of William L. Moran*, ed. Tzvi Abusch, John Huehnergard, Piotr Steinkeller, 203-17. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

Hallof, Klaus, ed. *Inscriptiones Chii et Sami cum Corassiis Icarique*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003.

Hann, Robert. “The Community of the Pious: the Social Setting of the *Psalms of Solomon*.” *SR* 17 (1988): 169-89.

Hansen, G. Walter. *Abraham in Galatians: Epistolary and Rhetorical Contexts.* Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 29. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.

Hanson, Paul. “Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6-11.” *JBL* 96.2 (1977): 195-233.

_____. *Galatians.* IVP New Testament Commentary Series. Downers Grove: IVP 2004.

Harrison, A. R. W. *The Law of Athens: The Family and Property*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.

Hays, Christopher. “Echoes of the Ancient Near East?: Intertextuality and the Comparative Study of the Old Testament.” In *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays*, eds. J. Ross Wagner, C. Kavin Rowe, and A. Katherine Grieb, 20-43. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Hays, Richard. *The Conversion of the Imagination: Essays on Paul as Interpreter of Israel’s Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

_____. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

_____. "Is Paul's Gospel Narratable?" *JSNT* 27.2 (2004): 217-39.

_____. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11*, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

_____. "Forward to the English Edition." In *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, eds. Richard B. Hays, Stefan Alkier, Leroy A. Huizenga, xi-xv. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009.

Heaton, E. W. "The Root שאר and the Doctrine of the Remnant." *JTS* 3.1 (1952): 27-39.

Heen, Erik. Review of *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*, by Mark Nanos. JBL 121.2 (2002): 376-78.

Hengel, Martin. "Abba, Maranatha, Hosanna und die Anfänge der Christologie." In *Denkwürdiges Geheimnis: Beiträge zur Gotteslehre: Festschrift für Eberhard Jüngel zum 70. Geburtstag*, eds. Ingolf U. Dalferth, Johannes Fischer, Hans-Peter Grosshans, 145-83. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

_____. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, 2 vols., trans. John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1974.

_____. *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*, trans. John Bowden. London: SCM, 1976.

Herrin, Elaine. "Hello, 'Daddy, God'; Goodbye, Dignity: If You Really Love Jesus Don't Honk." *Christianity Today* 28.12 (1984): 88.

Herrmann, Peter. *New Documents from Lydia*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007.

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*, ed. Noel Malcolm. Oxford: Clarendon, 2011.

Hodge, Caroline E. Johnson. *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Holladay, William. *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, chapters 26-52*, ed. Paul D. Hanson. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

_____. *Jeremiah: Spokesman Out of Time*. Philadelphia: Pilgrim, 1974.

Hollander, John. *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.

Holthuis, Susanne. *Intertextualität*: *Aspekte einer rezeptionsorientierten Konzeption*. Stauffenburg Colloquium 28. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 1993.

Hooker, Morna D. *From Adam to Christ: Essays on Paul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

_____. "'Heirs of Abraham': The Gentiles' Role in Israel's Story: A Response to Bruce W. Longenecker." In *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, ed. Bruce W. Longenecker, 85-96. Louisville: *WJK*, 2002.

_____. "Interchange in Christ and Ethics." *JSNT* 25 (1985): 3-17.

Horbury, William. "Messianism in the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha." In *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*, ed. John Day, 402-433. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 270. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1998.

Horn, Friedrich Wilhelm. "Kyrios und Pneuma bei Paulus." In *Paulinische Christologie: exigetische Beiträge: Hans Hübner zum 70. Geburtstag*, eds. Udo Schnelle, and Thomas Söding, 59-75. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.

Horton, William S. "Metaphor and Readers' Attributions of Intimacy." *Memory & Cognition* 35.1 (2007): 87-94.

Howe, Bonnie. *Because You Bear This Name: Conceptual Metaphor and the Moral Meaning of 1 Peter*. Biblical Interpretation 81. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Howgego, Christopher. *Ancient History from Coins*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Huebner, Sabine R. "'Brother-Sister' Marriage in Roman Egypt: A Curiosity of Humankind or a Widespread Family Strategy." *JRS* 97 (2007): 27-40.

Hurtado, Larry. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

Hurtado, Larry, and Paul Owen, eds. *"Who is This Son of Man?": The Latest Scholarship on a Puzzling Expression of the Historical Jesus*. London: T & T Clark, 2011.

Isaeus. Trans. Edward Seymour Forster. Loeb Classical Library 202. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Jankovic, Rachel. *Loving the Little Years: Motherhood in the Trenches*. Moscow, ID: Canon Press, 2010.

Jegher-Bucher, Verena. *Der Galaterbrief auf dem Hintergrund antiker Epistolographie und Rhetorik: ein anderes Paulusbild.* Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 78. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1991.

Jenkins, Richard. *Social Identity*, 3rd ed. London: Routledge, 2008.

Jeremias, Joachim. *Abba: Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.

_____. *The Central Message of the New Testament*. London: SCM, 1965.

_____. *New Testament Theology*, trans. John Bowden. London: SCM, 1971.

_____. *Prayers of Jesus*, trans. John Bowden, Christoph Burchard, and John Reumann. Studies in Biblical Theology: Series II 6. London: SCM, 1967.

Jewett, Paul K. "The Holy Spirit as Female?" *Reformed Journal* 28.4 (1978): 10-12.

Jewett, Robert. "The Law and the Coexistence of Jews and Gentiles in Romans." *Int* 39.4 (1985): 341-56.

_____. *Romans*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

Johnson, Joel T. and Shelley E. Taylor. "The Effect of Metaphor on Political Attitudes." *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 2 (1981): 305-316.

Jonge, Marinus de. *Jesus, the Servant Messiah.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.

Joseph, Simon S. "Seek His Kingdom": Q 12, 22b-31, God's Providence, and Adamic Wisdom." *Bib* 92.3 (2011): 392-410.

Josephus, Flavius. *Jewish Antiquities*, trans. Henry St. John Thackeray. Loeb Classical Library 242. London: Heinemann, 1930.

Jüncker, Gunther. "'Children of Promise': Spiritual Paternity and Patriarch Typology in Galatians and Romans." *BBR* 17.1 (2007): 131-60.

Kaiser, Otto. "Covenant and Law in Ben Sira." In *Covenant as Context: Essays in Honour of E. W. Nicholson*, eds. A. D. H. Mayes and R. B. Salters, 235-60. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Kammler, Hans-Christian. "Die Prädikation Jesu Christi als 'Gott' und die paulinische Christologie: Erwägungen zur Exegese von Röm 9,5b." *ZNW* 94.3-4 (2003): 164-80.

Käsemann, Ernst. *Commentary on Romans*, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

Kaser, Max. *Das Römische Privatrecht: Das Altrömische, das Vorklassische und Klassische Recht*, vol 1. Munich: Beck, 1971.

Katz, Albert N. "Preface." In *Figurative Language Comprehension: Social and Cultural Influences*, eds. Herbert L. Colston, and Albert N. Katz, ix-xi. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2005.

Keesmaat, Sylvia. "Exodus and the Intertextual Transformation of Tradition in Romans 8:14-30." *JSNT* 54 (1994): 29-56.

_____. *Paul and His Story: (Re)interpreting the Exodus Tradition.* Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 181. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Kim, Johann D. *God, Israel, and the Gentiles: Rhetoric and Situation in Romans 9-11.* Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 176. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2000.

King, B. B. "Time is a Thief." *Love Me Tender*. MCA CD, 1991.

Kirchner, Johannes, ed. *Inscriptiones atticae Euclidis anno anteriores*. 4 vols. Inscriptiones Graecae. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1913-1940.

Kirk, J. R. Daniel. "Appointed Son(s): An Exegetical Note on Romans 1:4 and 8:29." *BBR* 14.2 (2004): 241-42.

Koch, Dietrich-Alex. *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 69. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986.

Köller, Wilhelm. *Semiotik und Metapher: Untersuchungen zur grammatischen Struktur und kommunikativen Funktion von Metapher*. Studien zur allgemeinen und vergleichenden Literaturwissenschaft 10. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche, 1975.

Kooten, George H. van. "Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ: The 'Church of God' and the Civic Assemblies." *NTS* 58.4 (2012): 522-48.

Kovacs, Jason. "Adoption and Missional Living." In *Reclaiming Adoption: Missional Living through the Rediscovery of Abba Father*, ed. Dan Cruver, 83-94. Cruciform Press, 2011.

Kövecses, Zoltán. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

_____. *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Kraemer, Ross Shepard. *When Aseneth Met Joseph: A Late Antique Tale of the Biblical Patriarch and His Egyptian Wife, Reconsidered.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Kraftchick, Steven. "Paul's Use of Creation Themes: A Test of Romans 1-8." *ExAud* 3 (1987): 72-87.

Kremers, Heinz. "Das jüdische Volk ist noch immer "Israel" – Volk Gottes: Eine Auslegung von Röm 9,1-5." In *Mission an Israel in heilsgeschichtlicher Sicht*, eds. Heinz Kremers, and Erich Lubahn, 37-48. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985.

Krieger, Norbert. "Zum Römerbrief." *NovT* 3.1 (1959): 146-48.

Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. Leon S. Roudiez, trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.

_____. *La revolution du langage poétique.* Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1974.

_____. "Narration et Transformation." *Semiotica* 1 (1969): 422-48.

Kroeger, Catherine Clark. "The Classical Concept of 'Head' as 'Source.'" In *Equal to Serve*, ed. Gretchen Gaebelein Hull, 267-83. London: Scripture Union, 1987.

Kuiken, Don, (et al.). "Locating Self-Modifying Feelings within Literary Readings." *Discourse Processes* 38.2 (2004): 267-86.

Kunst, Christiane. *Römische Adoption: Zur Strategie einer Familienorganisation.* Frankfurter althistorische Beiträge 10. Hennef: Marthe Clauss, 2005.

Kurylowicz, Marek. *Die Adoptio im klassichen römischen Recht*. Studia Antiqua. Warsaw: University of Warszawskiego, 1981.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Turner. *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Lampe, Peter. *Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries: From Paul to Valentinus*, trans. Michael Steinhauser, ed. Marshall D. Johnson. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.

Lanham, Richard. *Analyzing Prose*, 2nd ed. London: Continuum, 2003.

Lietzmann, H. "Zwei Notizen zu Paulus." *SPAW* 8 (1930): 151-56.

Lightfoot, J. B. *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, 10th ed. London: MacMillan, 1890.

Liubinskas, Susann. “Identification by Spirit Alone: Community-Identity Construction in Galatians 3:19-4:7.” *AsTJ* 67.1 (2012): 27-55.

Llamas, Carmen, and Dominic Watt, eds. *Language and Identities*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010.

Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, ed. Peter H. Nidditch. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.

Løland, Hanne. *Silent or Salient Gender?: The Interpretation of Gendered God-Language in the Hebrew Bible Exemplified in Isaiah 42, 46, and 49*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament II 32. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Longenecker, Bruce. “Different Answers to Different Issues: Israel, the Gentiles and Salvation History in Romans 9-11.” *JSNT* 36 (1989): 95-123.

_____. “Sharing in Their Spiritual Blessings?: The Stories of Israel in Galatians and Romans.” In *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, ed. Bruce W. Longenecker, 58-84. Louisville: *WJK*, 2002.

_____. *The Triumph of Abraham’s God: The Transformation of Identity in Galatians*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998.

Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas: Word Books, 1990.

Louw, J. P., and Eugene A. Nida, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains.* New York: United Bible Societies, 1988.

Lundbom, Jack R. *Jeremiah 21-36.* Anchor Bible Commentary. New York: Doubleday, 2004.

Lütgert, Wilhelm. *Gesetz und Geist: Eine Untersuchung zur Vorgeschichte des Galaterbriefs.* Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie 22. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1919.

Luz, Ulrich. *Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus*. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie 49. Munich: Kaiser, 1968.

Lyall, Francis. “Roman Law in the Writings of Paul: Adoption.” *JBL* 88 (1969): 458-66.

_____. *Slaves, Citizens, Sons: Legal Metaphors in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Academie Books, 1984.

Maartens, P. J. “Inference and Relevance in Paul’s Allegory of the Wild Olive Tree.” *HvTSt* 53.4 (1997): 1000-1029.

Macky, Peter. *The Centrality of Metaphors to Biblical Thought: A Method for Interpreting the Bible*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990.

Malay, Hasan, and Marijana Ricl. “Some Funerary Inscriptions from Lydia.” *EA* 39 (2006): 71 no. 45.

Malherbe, Abraham J. *The Letters to the Thessalonians*. Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

Marböck, Johannes. “Sir 38, 24-39, 11: Der schriftgelehrt Weise.” In *La Sagesse de l’Ancien Testament*, ed. M. Gilbert, 293-316. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1979.

Margolick, David. *Strange Fruit: The Biography of a Song*. New York: Ecco Press, 2001.

Marshall, I. Howard. “Living in the ‘Flesh.’” *BSac* 159 (2002): 387-403.

Martin, Dale B. *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

Martinich, A. P. “A Theory for Metaphor.” In *The Philosophy of Language*, 5th Ed., ed. A. P. Martinich, 485-96. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Martyn, J. Louis. “A Law-Observant Mission to the Gentiles: The Background of Galatians.” *SJT* 38.3 (1985): 307-24.

_____. *Galatians*. Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1997.

_____. “Paul and His Jewish-Christian Interpreters.” *USQR* 42 (1988): 1-15.

Matera, Frank. *Galatians*. Sacra Pagina. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992.

Mawhinney, Allen. “God as Father: Two Popular Theories Reconsidered.” *JETS* 31.2 (1988): 181-89.

Mawhinney, Allen. “*Huiothesia* in the Pauline Epistles: Its Background, Use, and Implications.” Ph.D. Diss., Baylor University, 1982.

Mayes, A. D. H. “Deuteronomy 14 and the Deuteronomic Worldview.” In *Studies in Deuteronomy: In Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. F. García Martínez, et. al., 165-81. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

McConville, J. G. *Deuteronomy*. Apollos Old Testament Commentary. Leicester: Apollos, 2002.

McFague, Sallie. *Metaphorical Theology: Models of God in Religious Language*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.

Meeropol, Abel. “Bitter Fruit.” *The New York Teacher* January (1937).

Meinhold, Arndt. “Gott und Mensch in Proverbien III.” *VT* 37.4 (1987): 468-77.

Meeks, Wayne A. “Asking Back to Jesus’ Identity.” In *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge,* ed. Martinus C. De Boer, 38-50. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

Mettinger, Tryggve N. D. *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings.* Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series 8. Lund: Gleerup, 1976.

Miall, David S., and Don Kuiken. “A Feeling for Fiction: Becoming What We Behold.” *Poetics* 30 (2002): 221-41.

Michel, Otto. *Der Brief an die Römer*, 4th ed. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1966.

Middendorp, Theophil. *Die Stellung Jesus Ben Siras zwichen Judentum und Hellenismus.* Leiden: Brill, 1973.

Mitchell, Jon. “Identity.” In *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*, eds. Alan Barnard, and Jonathan Spencer, 368-69. Hoboken: Taylor & Francis, 2010.

Mitchell, Stephen. *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods*, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.

_____. *Regional Epigraphic Catalogues of Asia Minor II: The Ankara District, the Inscriptions of North Galatia*. British Institute of Archeology at Ankara Monograph 4. Oxford: B. A. R. 1982.

Moffat, James. *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1933.

Moloney, Francis J. *The Gospel of John*. Sacra Pagina. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1989.

Montefiore, Claude G. *The Old Testament and After.* London: Macmillan, 1923.

Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans* New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1996.

Moore, Carey. *Judith*. Anchor Bible Commentary. Garden City: Doubleday, 1985.

Moore, Russell D. *Adopted For Life: The Priority of Adoption for Christian Families & Churches*. Wheaton: Crossway, 2009.

Morgan, Gareth. *Images of Organizations*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997.

Morris, Leon. *The Epistle to the Romans.* Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

_____. *The Gospel of John*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. *He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in Israel and Later Judaism*, trans. G. W. Anderson. Nashville: Abingdon, 1956.

Moyise, Steve. "Intertextuality and Historical Approaches to the Use of Scripture in the New Testament." In *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, eds. Richard B. Hays, Stefan Alkier, Leroy A. Huizenga, 23-32. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009.

Müller-Richter, Klaus, and Arturo Larcati. *Kampf der Metapher!* Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophish-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 634. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996.

Munck, Johannes. *Christ and Israel: An Interpretation of Romans 9-11*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.

_____. *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*, trans. Frank Clarke. London: SCM, 1959.

Mundhenk, Norman. "Adoption: Being Recognized as Son." *BT* 59.4 (2008): 169-78.

Murray, John. *Collected Writings of John Murray*, 2 vols. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1977.

Murray, John. *The Epistle to the Romans*, 2 vols. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965.

Mussner, Franz. *Galaterbrief.* Herders theologischer Kommentar zum neuen Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 1977.

Nanos, Mark. *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.

_____. "The Jewish Context of the Gentile Audience Addressed in Paul's Letter to the Romans." *CBQ* 61.2 (1999): 283-304.

_____. *The Mystery of Romans: The Jewish Context of Paul's Letter*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.

_____. "What Was at Stake in Peter's 'Eating with Gentiles' at Antioch?" In *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation*, ed. Mark Nanos, 300-16. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002.

Nelson, Richard. *Deuteronomy*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: WJK, 2002.

Neusner, Jacob. *Canon and Connection: Intertextuality in Judaism*. Studies in Judaism. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1987.

_____. *From Politics to Piety: The Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism*, 2nd ed. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2003.

Nickelsburg, George. "Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6-11." *JBL* 96.3 (1977): 383-405.
_____. *1 Enoch 1*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.

Niebuhr, Karl-Wilhelm. "'Nicht alle aus Israel sind Israel' (Röm 9,6b): Römer 9-11 als Zeugnis paulinischer Anthropologie." In *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilks, and J. Ross Wagner, 433-62. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. "On Truth and Lie in an Extra-Moral Sense." In *The Portable Nietzsche*, ed. and trans. Walter Kaufmann, 46-47. New York: Penguin Books, 1982.

Oakes, Peter. Review of *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*, by Mark Nanos. JSS 49.1 (2004): 165-67.

O'Brien, Gerald V. "Metaphors and the Pejorative Framing of Marginalized Group: Implications for Social Work Education." *Journal of Social Work Education* 45.1 (2009): 29-46.

O'Dell, Jerry. "The Religious Background of the Psalms of Solomon (Re-evaluated in the Light of the Qumran Texts)." *RevQ* 3 (1961): 241-57.

Ohnuki-Tierney, Emiko. "Embedding and Transforming Polytrope: The Monkey as Self in Japanese Culture." In *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, ed. James W. Fernandez, 159-89. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.

Omanson, Roger L. *A Textual Guide to the Greek New Testament: An Adaptation of Bruce M. Metzger's Textual Commentary for the needs of Translators*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.

Ortony, Andrew, Gerald Clore, and Alan Collins. *The Cognitive Structure of Emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Orwell, George. *Essays*, ed. John Carey. Everyman's Library. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002.

Osborne, Grant. *Romans.* IVP New Testament Commentary Series. Downers Grove: IVP, 2004.

Overland, Paul. "Did the Sage Draw from the Shema? A Study of Proverbs 3:1-12." *CBQ* 62 (2000): 424-40.

Parker, Trent S., and Karen S. Wampler. "Changing Emotion: The Use of Therapeutic Storytelling." *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy* 32.2 (2006): 155-66.

Pascal, Blaise. *The Pensées*, trans. J. M. Cohen. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1961.

Pasoli, Elio. *Acta Fratrum Arvalium*. Bologna: Zuffi, 1950.

Peppard, Michael. "Adopted and Begotten Sons of God: Paul and John on Divine Sonship." *CBQ* 73 (2011): 92-110.

_____. *The Son of God in the Roman World: Divine Sonship in Its Social and Political Context*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Pesch, Rudolf. *Römerbrief.* Neue Echter Bibel 6. Würtzburg: Echter, 1994.

Pfister, Manfred. "Konzepte der Intertextualität." In *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, eds. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister, 1-30. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1985.

Philo of Alexandria. *Philo*, trans. F. H. Colson, vol. 6. Loeb Classical Library 289. London: Heinemann, 1966.

Piper, John. "'The Frank and Manly Mr. Ryle': The Value of a Masculine Ministry." *JBMW* 17.1 (2012): 10-22.

_____. *The Future of Justification.* Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2007.

Plutarch. *Moralia*, 14 vols., trans. Frank Cole Babbitt, et. al. Loeb Classical Library. New York: Heinemann, 1927-2004.

Porter, Stanley, ed. *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Powery, Emerson. "'The Groans of 'Brother Saul': An Exploratory Reading of Romans 8 for 'Survival.'" *WW* 24.3 (2004): 315-22.

Quesnel, Michel. "La Figure de la Mort Dans L'Épître aux Romains: Fonction Rhétorique et Argumentative." In *The Letter to the Romans*, ed. Udo Schnelle, 55-73. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.

Quinn, Naomi. "The Cultural Basis of Metaphor." In *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, ed. James W. Fernandez, 56-93. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.

Quintilian. *Institutio Oratio*, trans. H. E. Butler. 4 vols. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1920-1922.

Rad, Gerhard von. *Deuteronomy*, trans. Dorothea Barton. Abingdon Old Testament Commentary. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966.

Reasoner, Mark. "Romans 9-11 Moves from Margin to Center, from Rejection to Salvation: Four Grids for Recent English-Language Exegesis." In *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner, 73-89. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Reddy, Michael J. "The Conduit Metaphor: A Case of Frame Conflict in Our Language about Language." In *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed., ed. Andrew Ortony, 164-201. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Reinbold, Wolfgang. "Zur Bedeutung des Begriffes 'Israel' in Römer 9-11." In *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner, 401-416. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Rey, Bernard. "Vie de foi et vie filiale selon Saint Paul." *MScRel* 39.1 (1982): 3-18.

Richards, I. A. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Ricl, Marijana. "Varia Epigraphica." *EA* 35 (2002): 102-112.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning.* Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1976.

_____. *The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language*, trans. Robert Czerny. London: Routledge, 1978.

Ridderbos, Herman. *The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary*, trans. John Vriend. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

_____. *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*, trans. John Richard de Witt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.

Riesner, Rainer. *Die Fruhzeit des Apostels Paulus: Studien zur Chronologie, Missionstrategie und Theologie*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 71. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1994.

Riffaterre, Michael. "Interpretation and Undecidability." *New Literary History* 12.2 (1981): 227-42.

Ritchie, L. David, and Char Schell. "'*The Ivory Tower'* on an '*Unstable Foundation'*: Playful Language, Humor, and Metaphor in the Negotiation of Scientists' Identities." *Metaphor and Symbol* 24.2 (2009): 90-104.

Roetzel, Calvin. "Διαθῆκαι in Romans 9:4." *Bib* 51 (1970): 377-90.

Ropes, James H. *The Singular Problem of the Epistle to the Galatians.* Harvard Theological Studies 14. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929.

Rose, Charles Brian. *Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio-Claudian Period*. Cambridge Studies in Classical Art and Iconography. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Röska-Hardy, Louise. “Metapher, Bedeutung und Verstehen.” In *Metapher und Innovation: Die Rolle der Metapher im Wandel von Sprache und Wissenschaft*, eds. Henri Lauener, Andreas Graeser, and Gerhard Seel, 138-50. Bern: Haupt, 1995.

Rossell, William H. “New Testament Adoption—Graeco-Roman or Semitic.” *JBL* 50 (1931): 186-200.

Rubinstein, Lene. *Adoption in IV. Century Athens*. Opuscula Graecolatina 34. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 1993.

Rubinstein, Lene, et al. “Adoption in Hellenistic and Roman Athens.” *Classica et Mediaevalia* 42 (1991): 139-51.

Rumelhart, David E. “Some Problems with the Notion of Literal Meanings.” In *Metaphor and Thought,* 2nd Ed., ed. Andrew Ortony, 71-82. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Rusam, Dietrich. “Neue Belege zu den *stoicheia tou kosmou* (Gal 4,3.9, Kol 2,8.20).” *ZNW* 83 (1992): 119-25.

Russell, Bertrand. *Logic and Knowledge: Essays 1901-1950*, ed. Charles Marsh. London: Allen & Unwin, 1956.

Şahin, N. Eda Akyürek. “Eine neue Ehrung für den Kaiser Domitian aus Bursa.” In *Euergetes: Festschrift für Pro. Dr. Haluk Abbasoğlu zum 65 Geburtstag*, ed. İnci Delemen, 79-81. Antalya: Suna-İnan Kiraç Akdeniz Medeniyetleri Araştirma Enstitüsü, 2008.

Şahin, Sencer. *Bithynische Studien.* Inschriften greichisher Städte aus Kleinasien 7. Bonn: Habelt, 1978.

Saller, Richard. “*Patria Potestas* and the Stereotype of the Roman Family.” *Continuity and Change* 1 (1986): 7-22.

Sanday, William, and Arthur C. Headlam. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 5th ed. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902.

Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. New Testament Library. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1977.

Sarna, Nahum. *Exodus*. JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1991.

Sauer, Georg. *Jesus Sirach/Ben Sira*. Das Alte Testament deutsch Apokryphen 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.

Schachter, S., and J. Singer. “Cognitive Social, and Physiological Determinants of Emotional States.” *Psychological Review* 69 (1962): 379-99.

Schaff, Philip, and Henry Wace, eds. *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, 14 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988-1991.

Schelbert, Georg. *Abba Vater: Der literarische Befund vom Altaramäischen bis zu den späten Haggada-Werken.* Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 81. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.

Schlatter, Adolf. *Der Brief an die Römer*. Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament 5. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1987.

_____. *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser, Kolosser und Philemon*. Erlaüterungen zum Neuen Testament 7. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1963.

Schlier, Heinrich. *Der Brief an die Galater*. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.

_____. *Der Römerbrief.* Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 1977.

Schneider, J. "στενάζω, στεναγμός, συστενάζω." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 7, trans. and ed. Geoffrey Bromiley 600-603. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.

Schoenberg, Martin. "*Huiothesia:* The Adoptive Sonship of the Israelites." *AER* 143 (1960): 261-73.

Scholtissek, Klaus. "'Geboren aus einer Frau, geboren under das Gesetz' (Gal 4,4): die christologisch-soteriologische Bedeutung des irdischen Jesus bei Paulus." In *Paulinische Christologie: exigetische Beiträge: Hans Hübner zum 70. Geburtstag*, eds. Udo Schnelle, and Thomas Söding, 194-219. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.

Scholz, Oliver R. "Wit und Regeln: Metaphern und ihre Auslegung in der Philosophie der Aufklärung." In *Metapher und Innovation: Die Rolle der Metapher im Wandel von Sprach und Wissenschaft*, eds. Henri Lauener, Andreas Graeser, and Gerhard Seel, 39-52. Bern: Haupt, 1995.

Schreiner, Thomas R. "Corporate and Individual Election in Romans 9: A Response to Brian Abasciano." *JETS* 49 (2006): 373-86.

_____. "Does Romans 9 Teach Individual Election unto Salvation? Some Exegetical and Theological Reflections." *JETS* 36 (1993): 25-40.

_____. *Paul: Apostle of God's Glory in Christ*. Downers Grove: IVP, 2001.

_____. *Romans.* Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998.

Schulte-Middelich, Bern. “Funktionen intertextueller Textkonstitution.” In *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, eds. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister, 197-242. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1985.

Schüpphaus, Joachim. *Die Psalmen Salomos: Ein Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts*. Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums 7. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. “Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians.” *NTS* 33 (1987): 386-403.

Schweitzer, Eduard. “Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der ‘Sendungsformel’ Gal 4:4f. Rom 8:3f. Joh 3:16f. I Joh 4:9.” *ZNW* 57 (1966): 199-210.

Scott, James M. *Adoption as Sons of God: An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ in the Pauline Corpus.* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zur Neuen Testament II 48. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992.

Searle, John R. “Metaphor.” In *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed., ed. Andrew Ortony, 83-111. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Serge, Mario. *Iscrizioni di Cos*. Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 2007.

Siebeneck, Robert. “The Midrash of Wisdom 10-19.” *CBQ* 22 (1960): 176-82.

Siegert, Folker. *Argumentation bei Paulus: gezeigt an Röm 9-11*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 34. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985.

Skehan, Patrick, and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. Anchor Bible Commentary. Garden City: Doubleday, 1987.

Smith, Martin. “Greek Adoptive Formulae.” *Classical Quarterly* 17 (1967): 302-10.

Söding, Thomas. “Verheissung und Erfüllung im Lichte paulinischer Theologie.” *NTS* 47.2 (2001): 146-70.

Sopory, Pradeep. “Metaphor and Intra-Attitudinal Structural Coherence.” *Communication Studies* 59.2 (2008): 164-81.

Soskice, Janet Martin. *Metaphor and Religious Language*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.

Spencer, Aída Besançon. “Father-Ruler: The Meaning of the Metaphor ‘Father’ for God in the Bible.” *JETS* 39.3 (1996): 433-42.

Staley, Jeffrey. *The Print’s First Kiss: A Rhetorical Investigation of the Implied Reader in the Fourth Gospel*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 82. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.

Stanton, Graham. *Jesus and Gospel.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

_____. Review of *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*, by Mark Nanos. *JTS* 56.2 (2005): 568-72.

Steen, Gerard, and Raymond Gibbs, eds. *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics.* Philadelphia: J. Benjamins, 2001.

Stenschke, Cristoph. "Römer 9-11 als Teil des Römerbriefs." In *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner, 197-225. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Stern, Daniel. "The Art of Fiction LII: Bernard Malamud." *The Paris Review* 61 (1975): 41-64.

Stienstra, Nelly. *YHWH Is the Husband of His People: Analysis of a Biblical Metaphor with Special Reference to Translation*. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993.

Stowers, Stanley. *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

Strecker, Georg. *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. M. Eugene Boring. New York: De Gruyter, 2000.

Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Paul's Letter to the Romans*, trans. Scott Hafemann. Louisville: WJK, 1994.

Tacitus, Cornelius. *Historiae*, 4 vols., trans. Clifford H. Moore and John Jackson. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1962-1963.

Taylor, John. "The Eschatological Interdependence of Jews and Gentiles in Galatians." *TynBul* 63.2 (2012): 291-316.

Tegtmeyer, Hennig. "Der Begriff der Intertextualität und seine Fassungen: Eine Kritik der Intertextualitätskonzepte Julia Kristevas und Susanne Holthuis." In *Textbeziehungen: linguistische und literaturwissenschaftliche Beiträge zur Intertextualität*, ed. Josef Klein, 49-81. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 1997.

Tennyson, Alfred. *Alfred Lord Tennyson: Selected Poetry*, ed. Norman Page. London Routledge, 1995.

Theobald, Michael. "Unterschiedliche Gottesbilder in Röm 9-11? Die Israel-Kapitel als Anfrage an die Einheit des theologischen Diskurses bei Paulus." In *The Letter to the Romans*, ed. Udo Schnelle, 135-77. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.

Theron, Daniel J. "'Adoption' in the Pauline Corpus." *EvQ* 28.1 (1956): 6-14.

Thiessen, Henry. "The Place of Israel in the Scheme of Redemption: As Set Forth in Romans 9-11." *BSac* 98 (1941): 78-91.

Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Thompson, Marianne Meye. *The Promise of the Father: Jesus and God in the New Testament*. Louisville: WJK, 2000.

Toit, Andreas B. du. "Forensic metaphors in Romans and Their Soteriological Significance," in *Salvation in the New Testament*, ed. Jan G. van der Watt, 213-46. Novum Testamentum Supplements 121. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Tolmie, D. François. "Salvation as Redemption: The Use of 'Redemption' Metaphors in Pauline Literature." In *Salvation in the New Testament*, ed. Jan G. van der Watt, 247-269. Novum Testamentum Supplements 121. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Tonstad, Sigve. "The Revisionary Potential of 'Abba! Father' in the Letters of Paul." *AUSS* 45.1 (2007): 5-18.

Trafton, Joseph. "Psalms of Solomon in Recent Research." *JSP* 6 (1994): 3-19.

Trebilco, Paul. "Creativity at the Boundary: Features of the Linguistic and Conceptual Construction of Outsiders in the New Testament." *NTS* (forthcoming).

_____. *Self-Designations and Group Identity in the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

_____. "What Shall We Call Each Other? Part One: The Issue of Self-Designations in the Pastoral Epistles." *TynBul* 53.2 (2002): 239-58.

_____. "Why Did the Early Christians Call Themselves ἡ ἐκκλησία?" *NTS* 57.3 (2011): 440-60.

Trumper, Tim. "A Fresh Exposition of Adoption: An Outline." *SBET* 23.1 (2005): 60-80.

_____. "An Historical Study of the Doctrine of Adoption in the Calvinistic Tradition." University of Edinburgh: Ph. D. Diss., 2001.

_____. "The Metaphorical Import of Adoption: A Plea for Realisation I: The Adoption Metaphor in Biblical Usage." *SBET* 14 (1996): 129-45.

_____. "The Theological History of Adoption I: An Account." *SBET* 20 (2002): 4-28.

_____. "The Theological History of Adoption II: A Rationale." *SBET* 20 (2002): 177-202.

Tsang, Sam. *From Slaves to Sons: A New Rhetoric Analysis on Paul's Slave Metaphors in His Letter to the Galatians*. Studies in Biblical Literature 81. New York: Peter Lang, 2005.

Turbayne, Colin. *The Myth of Metaphor*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962.

Turner, Mark. *Death is the Mother of Beauty: Mind, Metaphor, Criticism*. Christchurch, NZ: Cybereditions, 2000.

Turner, Victor. *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974.

"The Twelve Tables." In *Remains of Old Latin*, vol. 3, ed. E. H. Warmington, 424-515. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Vanhoozer, Kevin J. *The Drama of Doctrine: A Canonical-Linguistic Approach to Christian Theology*. Louisville: WJK, 2005.

_____. *Is There a Meaning in This Text?: The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998.

Vèrmes, Géza. *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels*. London: Collins, 1973.

_____. *Jesus and the World of Judaism.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.

Wagner, J. Ross. "Not from the Jews Only, But Also from the Gentiles: Mercy to the Nations in Romans 9-11." In *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner, 417-31. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Wahl, Harald-Martin. "Ester, das adoptierte Waisenkind: Zur Adoption im Alten Testament." *Bib* 80.1 (1999): 78-99.

Walser, Andreas Victor. "ΘΥΓΑΤΡΟΘΕΣΙΑ – Ein Neues Zeignis aus Kaunos für die Adoption von Frauen." *EA* 37 (2004): 101-106.

Walters, James C. "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance." In *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, ed. J. Paul Sampley, 42-76. Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 2003.

Wartofsky, Marx. *Models: Representation and the Scientific Understanding*. Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science 48. London: Reidel, 1979.

Watson, Nigel. "And if Children, Then Heirs – Why Not Sons?" *ABR* 49 (2001): 53-56

Westerholm, Stephen. *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The Lutheran Paul and His Critics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Westermann, Claus. *Isaiah 40-66*, trans. David M. G. Stalker. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.

Wierzbecka, Anna. "Everyday Conceptions of Emotion: A Semantic Perspective." In *Everyday Conceptions of Emotion*, eds. James Russell (et al.), 17-45. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1995.

Williams, David. *Paul's Metaphors: Their Context and Character*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999.

Winninge, Mikael. *Sinners and the Righteous: A Comparative Study of the Psalms of Solomon and Paul's Letters*. Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series 26. Stockholm: Almqvist &Wiskell, 1995.

Witherington, Ben, III. *New Testament Rhetoric: An Introductory Guide to the Art of Persuasion in and of the New Testament*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2009.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *The Wittgenstein Reader*, ed. Anthony Kenny. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006.

Witulski, Thomas. *Die Adressaten des Galaterbriefes: Untersuchungen zur Gemeinde von Antiochia ad Pisidiam.* Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 193. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.

Wolde, Ellen van. "Trendy Intertextuality?" In *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel*, ed. Sipke Drasma, 43-49. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1989.

Wolter, Michael. "Das Israelprobleme nach Gal 4,21-31 und Röm 9-11." *ZTK* 107 (2010): 1-30.

Woyke, Johannes. "Nochmals zu den 'schawchen und unfähigen Elementen' (Gal 4.9): Paulus, Philo und die στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου." *NTS* 54.2 (2008): 221-34.

Wright, N. T. *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology.* Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992.

_____. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 2 vols. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013.

_____. *Paul: In Fresh Perspective.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.

Wright, Robert B. *The Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Edition.* Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies 1. New York: T & T Clark, 2007.

_____. "Psalms of Solomon." In *OTP*, vol. 2, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 639-70. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983.

_____. "The Psalms of Solomon, the Pharisees, and the Essenes." In *1972 Proceedings: International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies and the Society of Biblical Literature Pseudepigrapha Seminar*, ed. Robert A. Kraft, 136-54. Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.

Wright, Robert B., and V. Schwartz, "Psalms of Solomon: Theological Importance." In *OTP*, vol. 2, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 643-46. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983.

Xenophon. *Memorabilia, Oeconomicus, Symposium, Apology*, vol. 4, trans. E. C. Marchant, and O. J. Todd. Loeb Classical Library 168. London: Heinemann, 1979.

Zetterholm, Magnus. "Pre-Christian Jewish Messianism: An Overview." In *The Messiah in Early Judaism and Christianity*, xxi-xxviii. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

Zhang, Peter. "Corporate Identity Metaphor as Constitutive Discourse in Miniature: The Case of New China Life." *ETC: A Review of General Semantics* 68.4 (2011): 375-394.